

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 25, 1987

The House met at 2 p.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, may we sense Your presence not only in the majesty of holy places, but in the actions of daily life. As You have created the whole world, so may we see Your handiwork in the struggles and the joys of life and the opportunities for righteousness in justice, in mercy, and peace. O God, may we not focus only on the hope of heavenly places but see Your presence in the moments of each day. This we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to designate "National Former POW Recognition Day".

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate September 18, 1987, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day".

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to designate the month of May 1987 as "National Digestive Diseases Awareness Month".

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 26, through May 2, 1987, as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week".

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a privileged report on a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLF reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

WHAT ABOUT THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT, MR. PRESIDENT?

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, back in the Nixon administration, spokespeople for the administration were fond of saying "Don't listen to what we say, look at what we do."

President Reagan has said recently and even before recently, that the Congress is spending too much money; it is out of line; it is responsible for the deficit, et cetera, et cetera. That is what the President says.

Now what the President does is submit a budget which calls for roughly \$900 billion in taxation and about a trillion 34 billion dollars in spending.

Simple logic will tell you that either the President is asking for too much spending or too little taxes or a combination of the two.

The President also says he favors a balanced budget to the Constitution. A week ago Monday in the State of Montana, it was breakpoint for the 33d State, which would have brought about an amendment to require a balanced budget in our Constitution.

I was there to testify before the legislature; I didn't see President Reagan.

H.R. 281—CONSTRUCTION LABOR LAW AMENDMENTS OF 1987

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, we are soon to consider a bill, H.R. 281, that does away with the practice of allowing a construction firm the right to operate a union and a nonunion shop. This practice is known as dual shops or double breasting. Presently, the law allows this practice, as long as the operations of the shops are totally and completely separate.

Why has this piece of legislation been introduced? Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple. This legislation has been introduced to redress the recent slide in the membership of organized labor. Twenty years ago, unions represented more than 80 percent of the employees on major construction projects. Today, they represent less than 30 percent.

The enactment of this bill would allow organized labor in the construc-

tion industry to extend compulsory unionism, even to right-to-work States like my State, North Carolina.

The unions of the construction industry maintain they are losing membership because of the establishment of dual shops. This is simply not the case, Mr. Speaker. They are losing membership nationwide because unionized companies can no longer compete in the marketplace. They have priced themselves out of the market because of their high negotiated wage scales.

I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 281 when it comes to the floor for a vote.

A \$100 MILLION BRIBE

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON of Louisiana, chairman of Energy and Natural Resources, is expected to introduce a bill today, proposing that the U.S. Government offer \$100 million a year to any State in the Union which will accept a nuclear repository on its soil.

This bill is a trojan horse designed to divide opposition in States that are now being considered for a nuclear dump site. But worse yet, it's a \$100 million bribe used to persuade some State, any State, to put scientific study aside, for money.

And where is this money going to come from? How can we, Congress, in these times of tightening the budget belt, pass a bill that pulls us back by leaps and bounds from our goal to reduce a growing deficit?

Senator JOHNSTON's bill has not enough regard for the health and safety of individuals. It ignores the real issue and that is to scientifically discover where the safest and most geologically appropriate place is to store high level nuclear waste.

□ 1410

EXTENDING DURATION OF OFFICE OF CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION WITHIN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 632) to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1979, as reenacted, to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

extend the duration of the Office of Classified National Security Information within the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO], the distinguished majority whip, to explain the procedure here.

Mr. COELHO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has asked the House to consider and pass the bill, S. 632. The bill extends the operation of the "Office of Classified National Security Information" within the Office of the Secretary of the Senate for a period of approximately 4 months, ending on June 5, 1987. By passing this bill earlier this month, the Senate has stated its need for this internal Senate function, and as a matter of comity regarding internal functions of the other body, the bill should be passed at this time.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the distinguished majority whip has described the matter accurately; it is a matter of comity. The minority believes, along with the majority, that the bill should be promptly passed.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) Section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1979 (2 U.S.C. 72a note), as reenacted by section 115 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes", approved October 1, 1981 (95 Stat. 963), is amended by striking out "February 28, 1987," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 5, 1987,".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on March 1, 1987.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 2, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1987 UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if a veto message from the President is received by the House on the bill, H.R. 2, prior to Tuesday, March 31, 1987, that consideration of the veto message be postponed until Tuesday, March 31, 1987.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I certainly shall not object, I only rise to say that I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Washington inquiring earlier in the day as to whether or not this met the needs of the minority, and I am happy to comply. We obviously have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO SAL LACAPRIA

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of our colleagues the fact that after 20 years of distinguished service to the House, Sal LaCapria, one of our official House photographers, is retiring.

The House is justly proud of its institutional memory, of its reverence for traditions and commemoration of great events. Sal helped us to capture many of these events through his photographs, some filled with the solemnity of special occasions, others showing Members of Congress in informal and unofficial moments.

Sal began service to the House on September 1, 1966. Before that he was for many years with the Associated Press, where his professionalism gained for him a reputation for excellence.

He was born in New York and, like so many of us, served in the Army before truly launching his career. He is married, has two children, and now makes his home in Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that the camera doesn't lie. I don't know how true that is, but I do know that Sal LaCapria captured the truth of this institution, in all its moods, for many years and did so with a high degree of artistry and personal charm.

Sal, you have been a fixture around here and I just want you to know how very much we appreciate what you

have done for all of us—and for this institution—over the years.

AN ADDITIONAL BILLION DOLLARS THIS YEAR FOR COAL STUDY IS BAD POLICY

(Mr. SIKORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President announced that he would request \$2.5 billion in funding this year to do next year what he promised the Canadians last year—a 5-year study of clean coal technology. The press treated it as big news. The Prime Minister called it "significant movement." It is—backward. We used to study the problem of acid rain to death. Now we're asked to study the solution to death.

The day after announcing this expensive, taxpayer-funded study, the President indicated at his press conference he wasn't even sure of the need to act on acid rain. He also said Gramm-Rudman is preeminent. The dollars aren't there for the President to spend, unless we take them from health, education, or national defense programs.

And even if the dollars were available, an additional billion dollars this year for coal study is bad policy. It does nothing to control the emissions that cause acid rain, and it violates the "polluter pays" principle, which holds that those who benefit from pollution—not taxpayers—pay to clean it up.

This clean coal program is just a costly presummit ploy. Taxpayers shouldn't have to pay for it. And money spent on acid rain, whether by government or industry, should be used to stop it—not study it while our leaders do an acid rain publicity jig.

FLOOD INSURANCE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1987

(Mr. UPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Flood Insurance Improvement Act of 1987 to assist owners of condemned homes located on the shores of the many bodies of water around our great Nation.

Because of a flaw in the current FEMA guidelines, owners of condemned homes cannot be compensated for their loss until the structure receives considerable damage—often not until their house—along with everything from garage doors to septic systems—falls into the water; seriously harming the quality of our H₂O resources.

Clearly, the hardship on a family losing their home begins when they are forced to move—not at the time of actual destruction. My bill would help relieve this burden by allowing the collection of 40 percent of their claim under the FEMA Program once a house is condemned—thereby giving the owner the financial ability to search for a new residence. This only seems fair.

My bill provides an important incentive to have the homes razed before it's too late. Furthermore, my bill eliminates some of the fraud and abuse in the current system.

For these reasons, and many more, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to assist shoreline property owners and those using the lakes. Shoreline homeowners in my district should not be forced to live in housing more suitable to Jacques Cousteau than Jack from St. Joe.

TIME TO LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD ON CANADIAN TARIFFS

(Mr. ERDREICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, in general, Canadian tariffs on our United States products are two to three times those of our Government on Canadian goods. It is time to level the playing field on tariffs with our largest trading partner.

To help further that goal, I am introducing a bill today that would instruct the United States Trade Representative to negotiate with the Canadian Government toward the reduction of tariffs on the product of expanded metal. An expanded metal manufacturer in Birmingham let me know that it must pay tariffs of over 10 percent when exporting to Canada, yet the Canadian metal products coming into the United States are assessed at only 3.8 percent.

This is a small industry, but the penetration of imports takes hundreds of U.S. jobs. The square footage of imported expanded metal has increased from 1.9 million in 1975 to 6.8 million in September 1986. The Canadian products comprise over 50 percent of total imports.

The U.S. industry accepts the reality of foreign competition here in America, but the Federal Government must see that fair trade exists, that export barriers are knocked down. Canada's tariff, about three times ours on expanded metal, must be eliminated. Jefferson County and American jobs depend on it.

ACTION VERSUS WORDS ON THE DEFICIT

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan said the other night at his press conference that he was against any tax-rate increases.

He has said many times that he's against any tax increases.

What he doesn't say is that his own budget contains some \$23 billion in new taxes in the form of user fees and Medicare copayments and increased student loan costs.

It's a strange thing to see a President say one thing and do another. It's strange to see him say he's against new taxes and then propose them in his own budget.

But that's nothing new for this President. He's said he's against deficit spending for many years, yet he has produced the biggest deficits in the history of the country.

I remember when he said he wouldn't deal with terrorists, too. He said he wouldn't trade arms for hostages.

If we've learned nothing else these past few months, we should have learned that we need to pay attention to what the President does, not just what he says.

□ 1420

THESE MONKEYS HAVE BEEN ABUSED ENOUGH

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall, in 1981, when the Maryland police raided the laboratory of NIH grantee, the Institute for Behavioral Research, and seized a colony of research monkeys who had been seriously abused. Subsequently, the researcher was charged with cruelty to animals and his NIH grant was revoked due to gross violation of NIH guidelines.

A number of us in the House wrote the President about the ultimate disposition of these monkeys, and in October of last year, we were assured by the Office of Assistant Secretary of Health that the animals would be transferred to the Delta Primate Center in Louisiana, will live out their natural lives with no invasive procedures. They will not be operated on and they will not be used to meet any research goals.

I have attained a confidential memorandum, Mr. Speaker, from the American Psychological Association, which is proposing that these monkeys now be given to Tulane University, where over half of them will be put to sleep, and the other half used for breeding purposes.

Mr. Speaker, NIH should think twice before they let something like this happen. If this goes through, the Department of Health and Human Services will not only have lied to the Congress, but to the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce from Michigan, which is probably even worse.

Mr. Speaker, I submit further information for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 1986.
Hon. RONALD REAGAN,
President, The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We would like to bring to your attention a serious and long-standing problem which could be quickly resolved with your intervention.

In these final days of the 99th Congress, we are deeply concerned with the outcome of an issue commonly referred to as "The Silver Spring Monkey Case." The case started in 1981 when the Maryland police raided the laboratory of an National Institutes of Health (NIH) grantee, the Institute for Behavioral Research (IBR), and seized its colony of research monkeys who had been seriously abused. Subsequently, the researcher was charged with cruelty to animals and his NIH grant was revoked due to gross violation of NIH guidelines.

Following seizure in 1981, the monkeys were warehoused at an NIH facility in Poolesville, Maryland, for five years at a cost of \$30,000 tax dollars per year. During that time both NIH and IBR stated in writing that they had no research needs for these animals.

Inasmuch as the animals had been victims of abuse and were not needed for further research, many concerned citizens called for their release to a private primate sanctuary where they could be rehabilitated and resocialized to live out their lives comfortably. In fact, private humane organizations have agreed to pay all costs involved with such an effort.

Some in the biomedical community have claimed that releasing the animals to the private sector would set a dangerous precedent by limiting the freedom of biomedical researchers. The fact is that this case has nothing to do with biomedical research in general. Rather, it is a unique case having to do with a researcher who violated the terms of his NIH grant and a group of monkeys who are not part of any research protocol, who have been terribly abused, and who are now a drain on government resources.

This case has been highly publicized for the past five years and has received sympathetic coverage by all of the major media. In addition, strong Congressional support exists for moving these animals to a private sanctuary as evidenced by a majority in both the House and Senate having signed onto letters to this effect and now, by 198 members of the House and 17 members of the Senate having cosponsored Resolutions to this effect.

The NIH has simply been unwilling to cooperate with the private sector or the Congress on such an arrangement. Rather, they recently turned the animals over to a government funded laboratory, the Delta Regional Primate Center in New Orleans, Louisiana. In the handling of this case, NIH has been less than straightforward with Congress, the Department of Health and Human Services which oversees it, the

media, and the American public. We, and many of our colleagues, regret the unprofessional and sometime deceptive treatment we have received from this federal agency.

Since the Silver Spring Monkey case represents an example of wasted tax dollars, bad science, and animal abuse, the controversy surrounding it will not go away until we can reach a reasonable solution.

We have personally investigated every aspect of this case and can assure you that on scientific, monetary, and moral grounds there is no justification for keeping these animals in a federally-funded research facility for the next fifteen years, which is how long they are expected to live. Clearly, this is a situation where the private sector should take over.

We respectfully request that you or your staff review the details of the case and join us in accomplishing this worthy and humane transfer. The Silver Spring Monkey Case is well-documented and we will readily provide you with any background information that you need.

Thank you for giving consideration to this request and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. SMITH.
CHARLIE ROSE.
ROD CHANDLER.

DISCUSSION NOTES FOR COUNCIL

Subject—APS' involvement to raise fund for the lifetime care of the Silver Spring monkeys.

Background—The 14 remaining monkeys (6 controls, 8 treated) have been housed at the Delta Regional Primate Center in Louisiana since last summer. The monkeys had been maintained by NIH at its Poolesville, MD, animal facility ever since their confiscation by police in September 1981.

The monkeys are the property of the Institute for Behavioral Resources (IBR) and at this time IBR owes NIH more than \$20,000 for their care and feeding. For the past two years the scientific community (including APS), governmental agencies, the Congress, and animal rights groups have been trying to resolve the issues surrounding the future of the monkeys.

The scientific community has negotiated with IBR and governmental agencies a possible resolution to which everyone (except the animal rights advocates who want the monkeys given to them) has given an agreement to the general details.

Proposed Agreement—IBR gives title to the monkeys to Tulane University, thus freeing NIH from any responsibility as to the future of these animals. IBR pays NIH \$16,000 owed for the monkeys' feed bill. (This is a possible snag as IBR in the past has refused to pay the bill. However, we have been told that there is a change of heart within IBR on this issue.)

After gaining title to the monkeys Tulane could euthanize the treated primates and complete the research. The control monkeys would be resocialized for purposes of breeding. The anticipated lifetimes for these monkeys could be as long as 20 years.

Because animal rights advocates have been gaining public and congressional support by telling how tax dollars are being used to maintain these monkeys when (the advocates) would pay for their keep, Tulane wants an endowment so neither state nor federal funds are involved.

If all 14 monkeys were to be maintained for the normal life expectancies, it has been calculated that \$95,000 would have to be

raised. With the treated animals to be euthanized it has been estimated that \$35,000 to \$50,000 needs to be raised. (This does not include the IBR feed bill, which may need to be included should IBR have another change of heart).

Proposal to APS—Fred King, director of the Yerkes Regional Primate Center in Atlanta, has been discussing with the Society for Neurosciences and the American Psychological Association the need to raise the funds to endow the lifetime care for the monkeys. Both organizations have agreed to do it if APS would be the third member.

Neurosciences, APA, and APS are the three organizations that have been involved directly in this seemingly never-ending episode, largely because Dr. Ed Taub, who was doing the research on the monkeys, is a member of all three organizations.

Dr. William Danforth, president of Washington University in St. Louis, has indicated earlier a willingness to solicit funds from the research intensive institutions. Neurosciences, APA, and APS would be the steering committee to solicit funds from the scientific societies.

Recommendations—It would be by my offering to Dr. Knox and the Council that:

The coalition be formed to secure funds to endow the care and feeding of the monkeys.

The coalition steering committee be increased to four: Neurosciences, APA, APS, and the AAMC. By adding the AAMC we get the deans involved which would be a help to Dr. Danforth who is going to have to raise the bulk of the needed funds.

The collection agency for funds be either APA or Neurosciences and not APS nor AAMC, both of which are conducting fund raising drives.

NABR be left out of this effort because (1.) it is a 501(c)6 and (2.) the monkey situation, in general, is viewed on the Hill as a PETA vs. NABR fight. The later came out loud and clear at the recent congressional breakfast.

A meeting with the major actors in this effort, including Danforth, Tulane, NIH, IBR, be held to be sure that everyone understands what is to be done and who is to do it.

No decision to be made by APS until it has had a full discussion by the Council at the end of this month.

MARCH 17, 1987.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 27, 1986.

Hon. CHARLIE ROSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ROSE: I am responding to your September 25 letters to President Reagan, Secretary Bowen, and Dr. Wyngaarden regarding the fifteen nonhuman primates owned by the Institutes for Behavior Resources, Incorporated (IBR), and cared for at the Delta Regional Primate Research Center. Your colleagues who cosigned your letter will each receive an identical reply.

As you know, the purpose of relocating the animals to the Delta Center is to ensure their long-term health and well-being. The Delta Center has agreed to comply fully with the conditions in the plan submitted to the Congress in May 1986: the primates will live out their natural lives, no invasive procedures will be performed other than those required to meet veterinary medical emergencies, and every attempt will be made to resocialize the animals. Although the Delta Center is indeed a research facility, its staff

shares our commitment that these primates will not be used for any research purpose other than resocialization. I am convinced that this agreement will continue to be fulfilled.

Resocialization of the primates as proposed by the NIH seems entirely consistent with the thrust of public concern. It is noteworthy that the Delta Center's program of animal care not only meets the highest standards for facilities and personnel but also is subject to recurring oversight by several agencies of the U.S. Government as well as a private accrediting body.

The chairman of the board of IBR remains convinced that the research in which these animals were involved should be completed and does not agree fully with the NIH effort to resocialize them. Because of its strong commitment to the Congress and to the public, however, NIH continues to encourage IBR's full cooperation in this matter. Assuming that cooperation, NIH and Delta Staff are confident about the prospects for resocialization.

There are no plans to separate the animals and send some of them to the Yerkes Primate Center or any other facility. All of the foreseeable requirements for resocialization are well within the capabilities of the Delta Center. The professional staff includes three clinical veterinarians, who are experienced in nonhuman primate medicine, and a behavioral anthropologist trained in animal rehabilitation, all of whom are fully committed to improving the social stability of the animals.

Because of these factors, I continue to believe that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Delta Center are following the most appropriate course of action.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. WINDOM, M.D.
Assistant Secretary for Health.

RELATING TO SEMICONDUCTOR ANTIDUMPING ENFORCEMENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 127) relating to the semiconductor antidumping enforcement agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

This matter was reported out of the House Committee on Ways and Means this morning at 10:30. It pertains to the resolution to ask the President to be tough with respect to the country of Japan regarding our semiconductor agreement that was entered into in September of 1986.

The resolution asks the President to take strong action under section 301. As the gentleman knows, last Septem-

ber, when we entered into the semiconductor agreement with Japan, we gave up valuable rights, one of which was to pursue two 301 actions, and we waive certain penalties that would have accrued to Japan, and in exchange for that, the Japanese agreed to open up their markets and not dump products in third countries and in the United States.

It is obvious that the agreement has been violated.

The second part, which is an amendment, is to ask that the Japanese Government maintain their agreement, which they have not, in a telecommunications agreement that was entered into in April of 1985. That agreement was, when Japan divested its telecommunications industry, they would allow up to 33½ percent participation by United States companies with the Japanese companies. At this time, the Ministry of Telecommunications has indicated that they are willing only to allow 3-percent equity participation.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I concur in the explanation.

The reason for the haste in passing the resolution is that the other body has passed a similar resolution, or rather, two of them, this week, and its effect, we hope, will be important on the officials of the Government of Japan, who are now being called upon to live up to their earlier agreements.

Since there may be discussions going forward as early as this week or this weekend, we think it is important that the House be recorded on this matter as well as the Senate. We know of no opposition to these two resolutions, the one in House Resolution 127; the other in the amendment which will shortly be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do feel concerned that we are getting into difficult territory here. We believe that the Government of Japan has not lived up to its obligation. That is a serious allegation. We believe that it is becoming more recalcitrant at a time when the passions in the United States to achieve responsible and fair-market access in Japan are becoming more inflamed.

It is never a good thing when one has confrontation in international commercial negotiations. We would hope that this resolution would not fan the flames of confrontation more, but that it would persuade the Government of Japan that the Congress, as well as the administration, is serious about achieving reasonable access, but more importantly, believes that the Government of Japan ought to live up to the agreements that it makes and signs with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, I know of no objection or controversy surrounding this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 127

Whereas the maintenance of a healthy domestic semiconductor industry is essential to the development of the United States economy and the preservation of the national security of the United States;

Whereas the United States semiconductor industry is a world leader in semiconductor technology and has demonstrated its competitiveness in all markets to which it has free access;

Whereas concurrent with three antidumping cases filed against Japanese companies in 64K DRAM's, EPROM's and 256K and above DRAM's, the United States Trade Representative on July 11, 1985, initiated an investigation into Japanese dumping of semiconductors in the United States market and lack of access for United States companies to the Japanese semiconductor market pursuant to section 301(d)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended;

Whereas on September 2, 1986, the Ambassador of Japan to the United States and the United States Trade Representative signed the Agreement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in semiconductor products which has been determined by the President to be an appropriate response to the practices of the Government of Japan with respect to trade in semiconductors, pursuant to section 301(d)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended;

Whereas in return for Japan's pledge of increased sales in the Japanese market and avoidance of dumping in all markets, the administration waived the imposition of dumping duties in two antidumping cases and suspended action under section 301;

Whereas during the last six months, collection of substantial dumping penalties against Japanese companies have been foregoing;

Whereas during the last six months dumping has continued and there has been no increase in access to the Japanese market;

Whereas these acts represent violations of a trade agreement negotiated pursuant to the provisions and authority of section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended;

Whereas the President has determined that any failure by the Government of Japan to meet the commitments and objectives of the agreements would be inconsistent with a trade agreement or an unjustifiable act that would burden or restrict United States commerce;

Whereas the faithful implementation of the commitments and objectives of the agreement is the only effective means of addressing the twin problems of access for foreign semiconductor companies to the Japanese market and the prevention of dumping of semiconductors by Japanese companies; and

Whereas the Government of Japan has failed to meet the commitments that it made in the agreement signed on September 2, 1986: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the House that—

The President should immediately take all appropriate and feasible actions under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974—

(A) to remedy and prevent further violation of the Agreement by Japan;

(B) to serve as an incentive for compliance;

(C) to compensate the United States for the harm suffered on account of noncompliance by Japan; and

(D) to prevent further injury to the United States;

Such actions should serve to increase, rather than restrict, international semiconductor trade and be aimed at enforcing commitments and achieving the objectives of the agreement, both with respect to market access and the prevention of dumping in the United States and other markets;

Such actions should be focused so as to directly penalize those who have acted inconsistently with the terms of the agreements; and

Such actions may be directed at products which contain semiconductors so as to avoid any adverse effects on United States semiconductor users.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATSUI

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATSUI: At the end of the Resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. (a) Since in April 1985, the Government of Japan, pursuant to Market Opening Sector Specific negotiations with the United States, agreed to permit equity participation of up to thirty-three percent by foreign firms in a new Japanese telecommunications service company;

Since that company would provide competition with Kokusai Denshin Denwa (KDD) in the provision of international telecommunications services via a fiber optics, trans-Pacific cable (from Japan to the United States through Alaska);

Since an international consortium consisting of Japanese, United States, and United Kingdom companies has been formed to compete with KDD, and to construct the trans-Pacific cable and to provide telecommunications services to Japanese, United States, and European consumers;

Since this consortium would enhance critical communications services for agencies of the United States Government such as the Department of Defense, and would create significant opportunities for the sale of United States technology and equipment for fiber optic cable and other project components;

Since recent action by the Japanese Ministry of Post and Telecommunications indicate that Japan may not permit thirty-three percent foreign equity participation in any consortium formed to compete with KDD, but instead may support only a three percent foreign equity participation;

Since such action by the Ministry of Post and Telecommunications would undercut the credibility of the MOSS process casting serious doubt on a negotiated approach to solving services trade problems with Japan;

(b) Therefore, be it declared, that the President should immediately take all appropriate actions to communicate with the Government of Japan to insure that the commitment made by Japan under the terms of the Market Opening Sector Specific (MOSS) telecommunications negotiations for up to thirty-three percent equity partici-

pation by foreign firms in any consortium formed to compete with KDD be fulfilled.

Mr. MATSUI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET IS MORT IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the American people have become very leery over the years. They just do not believe certain statements anymore, like "I'll still love you in the morning," "I work for the Government and I am here really to give you a hand," and "As President, I won't raise your taxes."

This rhetoric will not fly any longer. The President says he will not raise taxes, but he has certain items in the budget, like asset sales and user fees, that add up to the tune of about \$23 billion.

Who is he trying to kid? This is the same President who promised in his first campaign, and I quote,

I will balance the Federal budget by 1983.

Now, after he was elected, he confessed to the American people and the Congress when he said,

I cannot do it by 1983. Ladies and gentlemen, it will take me until 1984.

I think we have gone the full circle from Disney fantasy to Spielberg camp at the White House. The reason I have no real power here is, Mr. President, your budget is mort, mort in the House.

Any budget that will drop vocational education, child nutrition programs, seriously impact upon housing in this country and yet continue to expand the military establishment is really completely un-American.

I hope the Members of Congress, after his visit, send him that message, not by signals—we do not work for the airport—but by strong votes.

□ 1430

THE NATIONAL SCHOOLBUS SAFETY ACT

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the National Schoolbus Safety Act. This legislation is important because we need to keep this issue before the public and not let it become lost in the bureaucracy. This bill grew out of the need to improve the safety requirements that our children face while riding back and forth to school each day.

Twenty million schoolchildren ride schoolbuses every year in the United States. We hear so much about the many dangers that are beyond our control. The lack of safety belts on our schoolbuses is an unnecessary danger, and it is time to change that.

Someone coined the phrase "safety belts" for a good reason—seatbelts save lives and prevent injuries. Each State is now considering mandatory seatbelt laws for passenger automobiles. The automotive industry has been experimenting with airbags. Child restraint laws are commonplace in all 50 States. It is about time that we put into practice on schoolbuses the safety features that we require on passenger vehicles.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 127, the resolution just adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GETS SUPREME COURT APPROVAL

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to say that in an excellent Supreme Court decision today affirmative action was upheld for women. It was a 6 to 3 decision by the Reagan court, and they said that women are a qualified pool of applicants, and you not only have to hire them but should promote them so that they can get above the bottom rung.

I think that is an excellent decision. It was a surprising decision to many people, and I think that what it says is that when they looked at the applications, they found out that women and

minorities were every bit as qualified as other people, so, therefore, they had to proceed to let affirmative action go forward.

SAFE FOOD IMPORT ACT OF 1987

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am joined by my colleagues FRANK HORTON, TONY COELHO, and ELTON GALLEGLEY in introducing a bill to toughen the Food and Drug Administration's [FDA] enforcement of pesticide restrictions on food products imported from abroad. This bill is designed to improve the FDA's inspection practices and to deter the importation of contaminated fruits, vegetables, and other commodities which violate U.S. pesticide laws.

A recent investigation by the General Accounting Office [GAO] confirms the widespread concern that the existing inspection and enforcement system is wholly inadequate. Their report found that the FDA routinely inspects less than 1 percent of all imported fruit and vegetable shipments. And in these shipments alone, more than 6 percent were found to contain illegal pesticides. Dangerously high levels of pesticides were found on everything from tomatoes to bananas. Given FDA's inadequate inspections, it is impossible to know how big the problem is.

GAO found that inspection and sampling decisions are not conducted on a national basis, but rather, are left to the discretion of onsite FDA inspectors. It also found that the limited number of sampled shipments did not even represent the broad range of commodities imported into this country. In some cases, commodity shipments from certain countries were not sampled at all, and in other cases, very few samples were taken from many high-volume imported commodities. Between 1983 and 1985, for example, cucumbers were imported from 27 countries. However, shipments from only 9 of those countries were sampled during this entire period. This occurred during a time when the violation rate for cucumbers was running significantly higher than the average for other foods. In another example, although over 17 billion pounds of bananas were imported during fiscal years 1983-85, only 160 samples were taken.

To make matters worse, FDA's so-called multiresidue tests may detect less than roughly half the pesticides available in world markets today. These tests can only identify about

120 of the 350 to 600 pesticides used on foods worldwide.

Under current practices, FDA allows imports of perishable commodities to go directly on the market—with or without inspection sampling. And even if the shipment is sampled, FDA does not routinely detain the shipment until the test is completed. In theory, FDA claims that if they later find that the shipment is contaminated, they will require the importer to recall this shipment from the stores. But in practice, such recalls are rarely successful. As a result, unwitting consumers usually wind up eating the contaminated food.

And even when FDA discovers contaminated shipments, enforcement action is rarely taken against the violators. Despite this serious violation, the importer is rarely punished. These procedures not only allow dangerous foods to reach American markets but also do little to discourage future violations. GAO's findings are particularly alarming when you consider that more than 25 percent of the fresh fruit consumed in the United States comes from abroad.

These serious deficiencies expose American consumers to unreasonable health risks and put American farmers at an unfair disadvantage with foreign farmers. Our bill incorporates GAO's recommendations into a comprehensive measure. It is one designed to protect American consumers from exposure to toxic pesticides on imported fruits and vegetables. The bill also requires importers to comply with the same standards that American farmers operate under.

Our bill requires the FDA to:

First, establish a plan within 90 days after the date of enactment for the redistribution of resources. It would require the agency to improve the inspection and enforcement of pesticide levels on imported foods and ensure that food shipments are sampled on a representative basis. This would include adjusting such sampling to reflect the types of commodities imported, their country of origin, and the product's historic violation rate.

Second, prepare a detailed annual summary of information on imported commodities, inspections, and enforcement actions conducted during the year.

Third, propose legislation to strengthen the penalty system to deter violations of the law by importers.

Fourth, report annually on research FDA conducts to develop improved methods of detecting pesticide residues on farm products.

American consumers will continue to be at risk from exposure to dangerously high levels of pesticides until FDA's pesticide inspection and enforcement system is overhauled. We can no longer accept these risks. We must

protect American consumers from exposure to toxic chemicals and punish those who endanger our citizens. This legislation will do just that. It does so by ensuring that imported foods comply with the same standards as food produced by American farmers. I urge your support of this very important legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—SAFE FOOD IMPORT ACT OF 1987

Section 2(a)(1) requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services (the "Secretary") to prepare a plan, within 90 days of enactment, for the distribution of Food and Drug Administration (the "FDA") resources for sampling imported raw agricultural commodities to ensure compliance with FDA laws, regulations, and enforcement requirements governing pesticide residues on these commodities; and to ensure the timely sharing among FDA districts of data and information relating to violations of these laws, regulations, and requirements. The Secretary must also describe the methods FDA will use to improve the enforcement of such laws, regulations, and requirements.

Section 2(a)(2) requires the Secretary within 45 days of enactment to publish the proposed plan in the Federal Register and to request public comments on the plan for a period of 30 days.

Section 2(a)(3) requires the Secretary to revise the plan as necessary within 45 days of each fiscal year.

Section 2(a)(4) requires the Secretary each fiscal year to implement the plan prepared or revised in accordance with sections 2(a)(1) or (3).

Section 2(b) requires the Secretary to prepare a summary within 45 days after the end of each fiscal year concerning the importation of raw agricultural commodities including each type of raw agricultural commodity imported during the fiscal year; the countries exporting these commodities; the volume of these commodities; the number of samples taken by FDA in connection with the laws, regulations, and enforcement requirements governing pesticide residue levels on these imported commodities; and the commodities, chemicals, importers, and countries involved in each violation.

Section 2(c) requires the Secretary, in any case an imported raw agricultural commodity is found during any growing season to violate provisions of laws, regulations or other enforcement requirements governing pesticide residue levels, to continue to monitor the compliance of the commodity with these pesticide residue laws, regulations and requirements during the immediately successive growing season.

Section 3 requires the Secretary to submit to the Senate Agriculture and Labor Committees and the House Agriculture and Energy Committees a report on FDA enforcement of the laws, regulations, and requirements governing pesticide residue levels on imported raw agricultural commodities including a copy of the plan and monitoring summary required under section 2 of the Act; and a description of the violations of these laws and regulations, the actions taken in response to these violations, and the reasons for such actions.

Section 3 also requires to be included in the report a description of any research conducted by the Secretary to develop improved methods to detect pesticide residues in or on raw agricultural commodities; and any recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate for legislation to add or

modify penalties for violations of the laws, regulations, and other enforcement requirements governing pesticide residues in or on imported raw agricultural commodities.

Section 4 defines certain terms for purposes of the Act.

THE LONG-TERM HEALTH CARE AMENDMENTS OF 1987

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join with my colleague, BRIAN DONNELLY, in introducing the Long-term Health Care Amendments of 1987.

Certainly, I commend President Reagan; Health and Human Services Secretary, Otis Bowen; and my esteemed colleagues, PETE STARK and BILL GRADISON, for their leadership and efforts in developing legislation which addresses the acute illness area. I am, however, very concerned about the direction in which we are headed on this issue. Under both the Reagan and the Stark-Gradison proposals, approximately 5 to 8 percent of Medicare's 30 million elderly would benefit from the part A and part B payment expansions. I strongly believe that by limiting our focus to the acute care illness, we will be missing a real opportunity to act upon what I consider to be the real risks that most senior citizens face in a truly catastrophic illness—namely, those associated with long-term and nursing home care.

The time has come for Congress to reexamine the Medicare Program and to address the changing needs of our senior citizens. Therefore, the legislation I am introducing today addresses some of the most critical long-term care needs of our elderly population. The bill also offers incentives to the working-age population for developing their own long-term care protection. I have attempted to create balance in the bill by incorporating a combination of governmental, individual, and employer incentives to address the issue of long-term care.

My legislation has three major titles:

First, my bill creates a new part C of the Medicare Program to offer financial assistance for nursing home, home health, and community-based services that the elderly need for long periods of time. This long-term care benefit is income related, that is, the amount of an individual's out-of-pocket expense is related to his income level.

The second provision of the bill provides for individual incentives to allow an individual over the age of 50 to contribute up to \$1,500 of noncore-interest income toward the purchase of a long-term care insurance policy. As an added incentive, this policy would retain a cash-surrender value, so that

should the individual predecease the use of the policy, its value would roll over into his estate and could be transferred to his spouse.

Finally, the bill provides for group incentives for long-term care catastrophic protection.

This Congress has a real opportunity to act on some very critical health policy issues, but I hope we do so in a manner that looks toward tomorrow as well as takes in the needs of today. Congress cannot claim victory on this issue if it fails to address the long-term care needs of the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein extraneous matter, I include herewith a copy of the legislation and a summary of its major provisions, as follows:

**LONGTERM HEALTHCARE AMENDMENTS OF 1987:
OUTLINE OF MAJOR PROVISIONS**

TITLE I—MEDICARE LONGTERM CARE BENEFITS

Section 1. New part C

(a) Scope of Benefits

The bill creates a new Medicare Part C to establish a longterm care program for the aged and disabled who are currently entitled to benefits under the hospital insurance program. The benefits provided to an individual under the new Part C are limited to home health services and nursing care.

(b) Longterm Care Deductible

Before providing reimbursement with respect to expenses incurred by an individual during any calendar year (and the three month period preceding the year), the total amount of qualified medical expenses incurred will be reduced by deduction equal to the longterm care deductible.

(c) Income-Related Deductible

The long-term care deductible for an individual in a calendar year ranges from a minimum of \$10,000 to a maximum of \$15,000 depending upon income. The amount of beneficiary liability is directly proportioned to income. A ceiling of \$32,000 is placed on upper-limit income liability.

(d) Conditions and Limitations on Payments

Payment for services under the new Part C may be furnished only to providers of services which are currently eligible under Part C claims as in current Medicare statutes.

Physician must certify that in the case of nursing facility care, services are required because the individual needs nursing care provided directly by or requiring the supervision of skilled nursing personnel or because individual needs rehabilitation services which can only be provided in a nursing facility on an inpatient basis.

Physician must certify that in the case of home health care, the individual required nursing care, physical, or speech therapy, or that the individual requires continued occupational therapy. The bill removes both the "intermittent" and "homebound" restrictions which currently exist for the provision of home health care. Prior to the provision of home health services, an individual plan for care must be established and periodically reviewed by a physician and the individual must remain under the care of a physician.

Payments to providers continue to be based on current Medicare reimbursement

of the lesser of the customary or reasonable charges.

(e) Payments to Providers of Service

Continues current Medicare payment standards for reimbursement of services to eligible providers. Stipulates that no payment shall be made from the Part C fund for services which qualify for reimbursement under Part A.

(f) Eligible Individuals

Each Medicare beneficiary who is entitled to benefits under Part A is entitled to long-term care benefits under this part.

Section 2. Financing

(a) The bill apportions one-half of the currently scheduled 1988 and 1990 FICA tax increases from the combined Old Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds (OASDI) to the Hospital Insurance (Medicare) Trust Fund. A separate accounting mechanism is established to track Part C expenditures.

(b) Employee and Employer tax rates are not increased.

Section 3. Amendments relating to scope of benefits

Standards for nursing home care and nursing facilities are defined. Nursing home care services are defined as those that meet Medicaid requirements for reimbursement.

Section 4. Miscellaneous and technical amendments

Section 5. Effective date

The amendments made by this title apply to expenses incurred for services furnished after January 1, 1989.

TITLE II—INCENTIVE FOR INDIVIDUALS TO PURCHASE LONGTERM CARE INSURANCE

Section 1. Tax deduction for payment of certain qualified long-term care insurance premiums

(a) Amends Internal Revenue Code

Allows additional itemized deduction for payment of premiums on a qualified long-term care insurance policy.

(b) Limitations on Deduction

Deduction per individual in a taxable year cannot exceed \$1500. The deduction is limited to only the amount of unearned, interest income used as premium payments. Thus, while an individual could contribute a portion of his earned income towards the premium payment, only that amount which is derived from unearned income and which does not exceed \$1500 will be allowed as an annual deduction.

(c) Definitions

"Qualified long-term care insurance premium" is defined as the amount paid by the taxpayer for a "qualified longterm care insurance policy."

"Qualified longterm care insurance policy" is defined as one meeting the basic criteria set forth in the model of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. The policy must provide coverage for at least 12 consecutive months for each holder, on an expense incurred, indemnity, or pre-paid basis, and must cover certain medically necessary services which are provided in a setting other than an acute care hospital unit.

"Eligible Beneficiary" is defined as either a taxpayer, his spouse or his elderly dependents who have reached age 50.

(d) Effective Date

January 1, 1988.

TITLE III—INCENTIVES FOR EMPLOYERS TO PROVIDE GROUP LONGTERM CARE COVERAGE

Section 1. Group long-term care benefits may be provided by pension plans

(a) In General

The bill amends Section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans to allow employers to establish a qualified longterm health care benefit for employees or retired employees.

(b) Qualified Longterm Care

Benefits are identical in scope to those defined in Title II of the bill.

(c) Effective Date

January 1, 1988.

INTRODUCTION OF DAUB-DONNELLY LONG-TERM CARE LEGISLATION

(Mr. DONNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB], this afternoon introducing "Comprehensive Catastrophic and Long-Term Care Legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased when the administration announced a catastrophic health insurance plan, and I was encouraged when the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON] introduced their own bill. Unfortunately, neither proposal goes far enough. Neither proposal covers the much larger issue of long-term care. Absent from the administration's proposal and Stark-Gradison are necessary expansions of home health care benefits and Medicare coverage of nursing home costs.

The Daub-Donnelly bill addresses those needs. It changes the definition of "intermittent" care to allow expanded home health care benefits. It provides Medicare coverage of nursing home costs. It creates private sector tax incentives for insurance companies to offer long-term care policies, and finally, the bill is financed by transferring the scheduled Social Security tax increase in 1988 to the Medicare trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, the Daub-Donnelly bill is a solid piece of legislation which Members on both sides of the aisle can support. The 100th Congress could leave no greater legacy to tomorrow's senior citizens and the elderly than protection against financial ruin in their retirement years.

CELEBRATING ANNIVERSARY OF MARYLAND'S FOUNDING IN 1634

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this fine and beautiful spring day, we in Maryland celebrate the anniversary of the State's founding in 1634. Three hundred and fifty-five years ago, Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, was granted the charter of Maryland on June 20, 1632. With 200 men and women aboard the *Ark* and the *Dove*, Calvert set sail for the colony from England on November 22, 1633.

The two ships arrived at the Chesapeake Bay on February 27, 1634. On March 25, the colonists, led by the brother of the second Lord Baltimore, erected a cross on St. Clements Island and held a thanksgiving service. A few days later they established St. Mary's as the capital.

Maryland, the first proprietary colony on the American mainland, was named after Henrietta Maria, the consort of King Charles I of England. The land was designated as "10 million acres of land between 40 degrees north latitude and the south bank of the Potomac River; a line drawn east from the mouth of the Potomac constituted the southern boundary on the Eastern Shore."

Although part of the land designated to Maryland under Lord Baltimore was donated to what is now Washington, DC, Maryland remains a versatile and beautiful land of many faces. It is America in miniature.

Within the limits of the State of Maryland you can find a working example of practically every stage of American history and life. Beginning at the tip of the Delmarva Peninsula where the Atlantic's sometimes feisty temper makes itself known, you can travel to the sleepy Eastern Shore towns of Cambridge and Chestertown where the treasures of the Chesapeake Bay keep alive the tradition of the "Maryland is for Crabs" slogan. Then consider the central bay area, where the Port of Baltimore and the Dundalk Marine Terminal connect Maryland to the vast cultural and economic resources of the world afar, to the western counties where skiing and farming are a way of life, and finally to the southern shores of Saint Mary's where it all began.

Tiny Maryland has just about every type of people—northerners and southerners, blacks and ethnics, civil servants and Chesapeake Bay watermen—almost all the diversity of the United States compressed into one small package. This one small package is what Marylanders have called home for 353 years now. As each generation changes, and as our way of life changes to meet the demands of the modern world, it is my hope that Marylanders will continue to work toward better understanding of human nature. In this tradition, Maryland will remain a diverse and integral part of the history of the United States.

RETIREES OF STEEL COMPANY IN KOKOMO, IN, SEEK PAYMENT OF PENSION BENEFITS

(Mr. JONTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a resolution in support of the former employees of Continental Steel Corp. in Kokomo, IN.

Continental Steel shut its doors in February 1986, yet these employees do not know—over 13 months later—what pension benefits they may be entitled to and when those benefits will be paid. This situation is intolerable.

Continental Steel Corp. was a relatively small steel company located in Kokomo. Continental was what is known as a minimill producing wire rod and other wire products from scrap steel. The company's demise was in part the result of import competition. Despite the President's Steel Import Reduction Program, foreign penetration of the wire market remains as high as 49 percent. The history of Continental Steel demonstrates the need for a concerted national trade policy in this country.

However, irrespective of the reasons for the failure of Continental Steel, we cannot continue to leave the victims of its collapse without relief. These employees, who gave many years of faithful service, deserve better treatment. I wholeheartedly endorse the resolution of the Kokomo City Council, and under permission to include extraneous matter I include the resolution for printing in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 2110

Whereas, the Common Council of the City of Kokomo recognizes the many sacrifices and continuing efforts of the employees of Continental Steel Corporation in their valiant efforts to insure the survival of Continental Steel Corporation as an important part of the Kokomo business economy, and

Whereas, despite such efforts Continental Steel Corporation ceased operations resulting in hardship and suffering to its employees, and

Whereas, the plight of the former employees of Continental Steel Corporation can and should be alleviated by the continuation of vested accrued basic pension benefits under the auspices of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation as provided by law.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Common Council of the City of Kokomo:

1. That the Common Council of the City of Kokomo supports the efforts of the former employees of Continental Steel Corporation in seeking the basic pension benefits to which they are entitled as a matter of equity and justice. The Council urges the appropriate agencies and persons concerned to do everything possible to provide the basic pension benefits to the former employees of Continental Steel Corporation.

2. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption by

the Common Council and approval by the Mayor.

IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

(Mr. COYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Department of Labor revealed that it has no plans to seek a supplemental appropriation this year for the Job Training Program that is funded under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, despite the fact that a number of States, including Pennsylvania, have already run out of Federal funds for the current fiscal year.

This particular Job Training Program is especially important in two respects: First, it is specifically aimed at those workers who have lost their jobs because of unfair trade practices employed by some of our biggest trading partners, and second, it is the only Federal program that provides direct income assistance to these workers while they are in a retraining program. In Allegheny County and Pittsburgh, this program has delivered vital relief to some 1,100 workers who have been displaced because of uncompetitive imports.

But the administration wants to change all that. The Labor Department says the current program gives displaced workers an unfair advantage over others who are unemployed. And it is costing more money than the administration seems willing to spend. So the administration's solution is to lump all of the unemployed into one big catch-all training program where the average amount of money spent per worker would be slashed to the bone. This approach is a sharp reminder of the administration's failed trade policies and it demonstrates a lack of commitment to those workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

A more sensible, and more sensitive, solution is one that gives workers some short-term income assistance while they seek jobs offering useful on-the-job training. This formula would also include an opportunity for workers to enroll in remedial education courses that would help them acquire skills and jobs in new technology industries.

The Ways and Means Committee has adopted in its trade bill exactly this blend of opportunities for displaced workers. This is not the time to retreat from our commitment to displaced workers, but rather it is the time to renew and expand the programs many displaced workers have counted on for years to put them back to work.

□ 1440

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO AID VETERANS

(Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my good friend, JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT from Arkansas, I have introduced legislation which will address the problem of some of our long-forgotten veterans. After World War II and up until 1957, there were some 220,000 military personnel that were exposed to ionizing radiation with the testing of atomic devices in the Southwestern part of the United States and also in the Pacific.

In addition to that, the occupation forces in Japan and Nagasaki and Hiroshima were also exposed to this ionizing radiation. Now we know that there are certain diseases that are increased in their incidence by exposure to ionizing radiation, such as leukemia, polycythemia vera, carcinoma of the thyroid and bronchogenic carcinoma to name just a few.

This legislation was introduced back in the 98th Congress but very little attention was given to it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we addressed this problem of these veterans who have essentially been ignored in the compensation and benefits that should be coming to them and their survivors.

THE LEGACY OF RONALD REAGAN IS A MOUNTAIN OF DEBT

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the President opposes new taxes and this he has said. The President's budget contains new taxes and this he has not said. User fees, Medicare fees, services costs, indeed, \$22 billion in new taxes from Ronald Reagan.

I would like to tell you this is a legitimate misunderstanding; a problem of communication. It is not. The fact is that there is more destroying the President's credibility than his sale of arms for hostages.

Mr. Speaker, the President is intellectually not an honest man. The President is for education, but he cut student loans. The President is for national security, but he has no trade policy. The President is for seniors, but he cuts Medicare. The President is against terrorism, but he trades arms for hostages. The President is against new taxes, but he has \$22 billion in new taxes in his own budget.

Mr. Speaker, two things are clear: The legacy of Ronald Reagan is a

mountain of debt. The legacy of Ronald Reagan is a sea of cynicism. Mr. Speaker, the President's greatest victim is his own intellectual dishonesty.

BUDGET DEFICITS ARE NOT WISHED AWAY

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is my fifth budget cycle and, frankly, I am incredulous that the administration is once again using its bag of tricks to hide perhaps the most fundamental problem this Nation faces—the budget deficit.

The President sent a fiscal year 1988 budget to the Hill that he said meets Gramm-Rudman targets. Nothing could be further from the truth. When all the gimmicks are stripped away, the President's budget is almost \$30 billion over. I remember when the Carter administration was villified for simply proposing a 1980 budget that contained a \$30 billion total deficit.

But there's nothing new in OMB's game. The Senate Budget Committee prepared a very interesting analysis. They asked how far off was OMB in hindsight—plugging in the actual GNP and inflation numbers—if the entire President's budget had been enacted. Between 1982 and 1986, OMB guessed wrong by \$92 billion to \$17 billion. This year it looks like they will be \$53 billion off. And in every year except 1984, they have conveniently underestimated the deficit.

The American people deserve better than this. It is time for the President to come to the table and to talk sense; to talk honest sense; to talk about real deficit; real reduction.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 200

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 200.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE INFORMED ELECTORATE ACT OF 1987

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Informed Electorate Act of 1987, which offers one solution to the growing problem of use and abuse of political television advertising. The bill is the companion to S. 593, sponsored by Senator PELL.

The bill would require television stations to provide a limited amount of free time to political parties in the 2 months before an election. The parties could then allocate time to candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, to be used between 7:30 and 8 p.m. local time. Spots could be no more than 15 minutes long, with at least 75 percent of the time made up of the candidates own remarks. Finally, each party would be limited to no more than 3 hours per station, so that no one station would likely be asked to provide more than 12 hours per election. Although I have always run a low budget campaign myself, I have seen a growing dependence on costly TV advertising to shape—and distort—campaigns. The extent of political advertising, and specifically negative advertising, in the 1986 elections is a case in point.

The Informed Electorate Act would improve the situation in two ways. First of all, it would reduce the advantage wealthy or well-financed candidates have over less affluent, but no less worthy candidates. Although the bill does not preclude the buying of additional time, it does assure some access to all candidates. Second, the bill provides some hope of elevating the quality of advertising by requiring the candidates own words to comprise at least 75 percent of each ad. This should go far to cut down on the mud slinging that has become all too prevalent in recent years.

The American people depend on their elected representatives to govern intelligently. They deserve the chance to hear the views of the candidates in an evenhanded forum, to enable them to make informed and responsible choices.

Some of you may remember that I introduced a similar bill earlier this year. I believe, as Senator PELL does, that the approach we've taken in this new legislation should respond to the objections to the concept of free political advertising that have been raised in the past. The bill is more limited in scope, but can be equally effective in addressing the current problems.

HISTORY AND THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today a small group of men met in Philadelphia and elected George Washington as President of their hastily formed convention. Six months later, after much debate and compromise, they had in-

corporated the best ideas of their century into a document which has not only become the foundation and guide of our Government and society, but also one of the most influential political parchments of the modern era.

Over the next 2 years, the United States and the world will celebrate and honor the Constitution, the men who created it, and those who made it work. It seems an appropriate time for a renewed and increased interest in history and its applications by all members of our society. We must not, however, allow our remembrance to degenerate into a mindless patriotic euphoria, nor should we engage in blind reverence for the hallowed names and deeds of the past. We should instead examine our history—from 1607 to 1987—and seek to evaluate our heritage with the same dispassionate yet learned perspective of the Founding Fathers. As John Adams noted, "Liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people."

Madison, Hamilton, Adams, Jefferson—all the best minds of the time—were obsessed with history and its implications, and our Constitution is in part a reflection of that obsession. The framers did not see history, at least not the history of any certain peoples or nations, as a linear progression. It was instead an organic cycle of genesis, development, and death. States and societies, no matter how powerful or prosperous, always carried within their culture the seeds of dissolution. Madison's notes on the convention are peppered with references to Greece and Rome, Poland and Germany. The Federalist devotes three numbers to the history of confederacies and their eventual demise. Jefferson said:

Experience hath shewn that even under the best forms (of government) those entrusted with power have, in time and by slow operations, perverted it into tyranny.

Looking at history, the prospects of success seemed remote for the new Nation, but the men in Philadelphia persevered and used history to build a new order. Jefferson said:

History only informs us what bad government is.

The Founding Fathers accepted this dictum and looked to history to show them mistakes already made, not for easy answers. According to Madison, their challenge was to create a government of which there could be found "no model on the face of the globe." He might have added no model in the annals of history.

The revolutionary generation had not only won independence from a corrupt government, they had also analyzed past governments, and figured out where those societies had self-destructed. Armed with this information, they attempted to fashion a cure for any foreseeable ills that might plague

the United States. The system that emerged, now commonly referred to as checks and balances, was arrived at by a new approach to government, a new synthesis out of old ideas, and the peculiar American genius for improving on already existing ideas, inventions, and institutions. Madison believed the Constitution was indeed something new, based on history but not subject to history. Late in his life Madison would write that the Constitution was "without example ancient or modern, a system founded on popular rights, and so combining Federal form with the forms of individual republics, as may enable each to supply the defects of the other and obtain the advantages of both." Madison and his colleagues studied the past and then shaped the future.

The framers realized that this was the last hope for a true republic and they relished the challenge. As Hamilton remarked:

It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not, of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend, for their political constitutions, on accident and force.

When a few wish to push ahead, to test a new invention, to put into action new ideas, there are always those who clamor for convention and look with abhorrence upon change. The Founding Fathers were not distressed by these attitudes. Writing as Publius, Madison asks:

Is the experiment of an extended republic to be rejected merely because it may comprise what is new? Is it not the glory of the people of America, that whilst they have paid a decent regard to the opinions of former times and other nations, they have not suffered a blind veneration for antiquity, for custom, or for names to overrule the suggestions of their own good sense, the knowledge of their own situation, and the lessons of their own experience?

He concluded:

To this, posterity will be indebted for the possession, and the world for the example of the numerous innovations displayed on the American theater, in favor of private rights and public happiness.

I believe the only way we will break out of the legislation of reaction we find ourselves mired in today is to adopt a historical outlook similar to the Founding Fathers. We cannot expect, nor should we want or trust answers from history, but a critical approach would no doubt help us inestimably as we try to keep history from overtaking us and continue forward with the vision that a republic can last in a world of despots and totalitarian regimes. It is still up to the United States to decide the important question. We must summon the energies, the resolve, and the critical abilities that will allow us to answer in the affirmative, just as Hamilton and the

rest of his generation did two centuries ago.

I believe this generation has a similar opportunity to achieve greatness. However, no matter how much innovation we bring forth, no matter how drastically we change our world, we will still have in us a part of Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton, Washington, Franklin, and Madison. We can never be totally divorced from history, only one step ahead. John Dos Passos noted:

In times of change and danger when there is a quicksand of fear under men's reasoning, a sense of continuity with generations gone before can stretch like a lifeline across the scary present.

It is my hope that we will be able to draw on the experiences of the Founding Fathers, without being enslaved by their opinions.

Our Constitution has survived for two centuries, and many more lie ahead if we have the courage to keep the experiment alive. Fifty years ago, President Franklin Roosevelt captured the essence and genius of the Constitution as well as anyone:

So we revere it—not because it is old but because it is ever new—not in the worship of its past alone but in the faith of the living who keep it young, now and in the years to come.

□ 1450

A BILL TO SUSPEND FOR 3 YEARS THE MILITARY EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR CIVILIAN TECHNICIANS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY], I am introducing a bill to temporarily suspend the Military Education Program for civilian technicians of the Army National Guard. The Military Education Program was established in March 1985, under the discretionary authority of the National Guard Bureau which oversees the various State National Guard units.

Civilian technicians employed under 32 U.S.C. 709 are outside the competitive service and must as a condition of continued employment maintain military membership in the National Guard. Under this new Military Education Program, all civilian technicians employed by the Army National Guard must attend these courses at one of two centers nationwide in order to be promoted militarily. The education program can last for up to 6 months.

In the past, civilian technicians could attend State run education programs on the weekends. Now under this new program, they must go out of State for up to 6 months, and the most deplorable part of the program is that they must use their annual leave time or leave without pay while they attend these courses.

While they are attending these courses, they and their families temporarily lose their civilian benefits such as health and life insurance and retirement benefits.

In addition to the problems faced by the individual workers, I am also concerned about what this new program will mean for the readiness of the equipment on which these technicians work. With these technicians away for extended periods of time for this new education program, there are no replacement personnel to work on our equipment and vehicles to ensure our preparedness.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible burdens placed upon these civilian technicians was brought to my attention by the National Association of Government Employees [NAGE] who represent all of the statewide Army National Guard civilian technicians in Massachusetts, with several units in my own district. But the problems created by this new Military Education Program are nationwide, and affect all Army National Guard technicians, wherever they are located.

The bill I am today introducing with my colleague from California, will suspend this program for 3 years while we get answers to the questions of preparedness and while we study the efficacy of this new education program. The Department of Defense would be required to report back to Congress by the end of 1988 on the cost effectiveness of the program, its effect on readiness and finally its impact on the benefits and morale of the civilian technicians. I think our bill is a fair temporary solution while the Defense Department studies the long term impact of this program, and I urge its consideration in the House.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] for introducing legislation to place a moratorium on the Military Education Program [MEP] for civilian technicians in the National Guard.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have looked closely at the National Guard Technician Program. Civilian technicians are Federal employees in the excepted service who must hold military status as a condition of their civilian employment.

Pursuant to National Guard Bureau directives since August 1985, technicians must complete professional military education training before they will be considered for promotion to the next highest military grade.

I don't quarrel with the Guard Bureau's determination that certain education requirements are necessary to ensure proper training of its personnel. However, the implementation of the MEP with respect to civilian technicians has imposed undue hardships on these employees. I fear that morale and productivity have suffered as a result.

MEP training can take anywhere from several weeks to 36 weeks to complete. Often, the technician is not close to home.

To complete the required courses, a technician must use his annual and sick leave. If this runs out, he must enter a leave-without-pay status. In a LWOP situation, civil service employees lose their health benefits, life insurance, contributions into the retirement system, and cumulation of annual and sick leave.

Placing technicians in this type of hardship situation is patently unfair. The military education is required, and if it is not completed, technicians can be denied a military promotion. If they do not earn a promotion within a certain amount of time, they lose their military status. If they lose their military status, they are removed from civilian employment. Clearly, technicians are in a "catch-22" situation.

In addition, it is worthwhile to keep in mind that many civilian technicians are veterans. This means that they do not lack for some type of military training. At the very least, it seems only fair that technicians should be subjected to the same training requirements as full-time military personnel in the National Guard. But this is not the case.

My colleague, Mr. MOAKLEY, has adequately explained other problems resulting from current implementation of the MEP, including the adverse impact on readiness of National Guard units.

The decision to introduce legislation which suspends the MEP for 2 years was not made lightly.

In early February of this year, I sent a letter to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, pointing out the various problems caused by the MEP. My letter was cosigned by nearly 30 of my colleagues.

We asked the National Guard Bureau to review these adverse consequences of the MEP, and to attempt to develop an administrative remedy. Unfortunately, the response we received did not acknowledge any of the problems cited in our letter.

Therefore, I see no choice but to address these problems legislatively. The legislation we are introducing today places a moratorium on further implementation of the Military Education Program in the Army National Guard through fiscal year 1989.

In the interim period, we call upon the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report which thoroughly examines the rationale for the MEP and its impact on cost, readiness, and benefits for civilian technicians.

Mr. Speaker, while we often should be reluctant to interfere with training programs for Federal employees, I believe this legislation is necessary to redress severe problems caused by such a program which have not been addressed administratively.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

REPORT ON EL SALVADOR AND NICARAGUA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, this special order is to report to my colleagues on the trip I took to El Salvador and Nicaragua some 2 weeks ago as vice chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee at the request of its new chairman, GEORGE CROCKETT. MIKE DEWINE and ESTEBAN TORRES also went.

I came back more than ever convinced that United States policy is correct—that we were right and continue to be right in supporting the Government of El Salvador and in assisting the prodemocratic anti-Sandinista forces in Nicaragua.

I want to primarily commend President Jose Napoleon Duarte for the significant progress which his administration has made in El Salvador during the past few years.

As most of us know, El Salvador has been moving along the road to full democracy. Since 1979, much progress has been made in the political arena in that country, including national assembly elections in 1982 and the free and open election of President Duarte in 1984, which I witnessed as an observer. Since then, President Duarte has continued to move his country toward a full democracy. He has called for national assembly elections next year and for Presidential elections in 1989.

By any standard, he has undertaken a democratic revolution in El Salvador based on freedom, not totalitarianism. He is attempting to solve the problems of his nation through a commitment to dialog and to civilian rule.

He is also to be congratulated for his deep and abiding commitment to human rights. There has been a dramatic decline in death squad activities in El Salvador and other human rights abuses and judicial reforms are underway there. A widespread human rights education effort has also begun. More remains to be done. President Duarte is committed to social reform and respects the will of the Salvadoran people in determining the future of that country.

The Salvadoran leader is determined to improve the economy of El Salvador in spite of a disastrous earthquake, guerrilla attacks on the infrastructure of that nation, and a decline in the export prices of many Salvadoran exports. President Duarte has wisely used U.S. economic assistance to better the lives of the Salvadoran people.

He has wisely professionalized the Salvadoran military, and that organization is assisting in stabilizing the country by providing security to the people of El Salvador who are being threatened by Communist guerrillas. The military is making progress in conduct of the war, and in respecting both human rights and the democratic process. I congratulate them and the Defense Minister Vides Casanova and urge them to continue and improve such activities.

All of these improvements have been made in El Salvador despite ongoing attacks by insurgents against Salvadoran economic targets and innocent civilians. In spite of their barbaric efforts, including indiscriminate mining,

the Sandinista-backed guerrillas have failed to create political instability and economic chaos in that small country.

President Duarte continued to call for dialog with the guerrillas in spite of their unreasonable demands. Unlike the insurgents, the Salvadoran President has called for a prolonged peace that will benefit all of the people in that country.

In this spirit I commend this special order to my colleagues praising President Duarte for his outstanding accomplishments.

President Duarte, on conditions on aid to El Salvador, said:

It would weaken me if conditions are put on military aid. If you put conditions on me, you are putting the authority into the hands of others and the result would weaken me but not the military.

□ 1500

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, as we consider legislation on this issue that we keep his words in mind.

We met with a number of groups in El Salvador, human rights groups. For example, we met with the Government Human Rights Commission. The commission works directly with the United Nations and with other international groups to include Amnesty International and Americas Watch; and while the commission now only reports on human rights violations, it may be able to prosecute in the future.

They reported that there were 25 cases of human rights violations by the armed forces that occurred in 1986 and 12 of those 25 cases resulted in prosecution, some released for lack of evidence.

The Salvadoran military do not have the court martial system, and the personnel must leave the military in order to be prosecuted by civilian judges. That is a real weakness in the system.

In the meeting that we held with President Duarte, I already told you what he said about proposed conditions on military assistance. He also told us that \$400 million in economic and military assistance for El Salvador is badly needed.

He pointed out that recent economic difficulties include a decline in the price of Salvadoran exports, the insurgency, the disastrous earthquake, a drought, the deficit, and return of many Salvadorans from the United States as a result of our new immigration law.

He did say that U.S. assistance has helped him to stabilize the political scene and to give human rights training to the military, and has brought social progress to the Salvadoran people.

He did say that he proposes a democratic revolution based on freedom and calls for a prolonged war of peace rather than a prolonged guerrilla war, as the insurgents are carrying out.

He pointed out also, in response to a question by one of our group that military assistance would not be needed at all if guerrillas would stop the war against economic infrastructure of that country.

He said, as he has on many occasions both in his own country and here, that the solution to the guerrilla war is a political, not a military one; dialog must be created with the guerrillas.

When we asked him about the question of whether or not Nicaragua was supporting the insurgency in his country, he said it was, and he pointed out to us that during the time that Salvadoran guerrillas held his daughter captive after they had kidnaped her, that all of the negotiations regarding her release were conducted with them in Managua, Nicaragua.

We also met with Gen. Vides Casanova, who is the Minister of Defense of El Salvador. He reported to us that since 1984, the military situation in El Salvador is better, and the armed forces have taken the offensive against the Salvadoran guerrillas. They are using more aggressive tactics, that they have air superiority which has hurt the guerrilla movement.

He said also that Salvadoran military operations are now 14 months in duration instead of 15 days, as in the past. He said that most of the military now respect human rights; and the army no longer interferes with civilian government.

He did say that the Salvadoran legal system has problems, which it certainly does; but that those are in the process of being corrected by judicial reform.

He said that the Salvadoran military now follows strict rules of engagement, but the guerrillas have none, however.

With regard to human rights, he told us, and I want to put in the RECORD at this point, he told us about the visit of the U.N. Special Rapporteur who commended for progress in human rights and made the comment that most of the human rights violations in that country are now being carried out by the guerrillas.

The summary referred to follows:

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL RAPPOREUR'S REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN EL SALVADOR

1. Following is text of summary of the U.N. special rapporteur's 1986 report on human rights in El Salvador.

SUMMARY

While remaining opposed in principle to the human rights double standard implicit in the continuing assignment of a UN special rapporteur for human rights in El Salvador, The GOES is largely satisfied that the 1986 report of the rapporteur is a fair assessment of the human rights situation in El Salvador. This satisfaction flows in large measure from the rapporteur's recognition of the tremendous progress made by the GOES over the past several years and the now officially documented increasing

human rights violations being committed by the FMLN/FDR. The main substantive issues in dispute between the GOES and the FMLN/FDR over the past year were largely settled by the rapporteur in favor of the GOES:

(A) As the existence of a special rapporteur has become a political issue used by the left to question the legitimacy of the Duarte government, Pastor's praise of human rights progress and commitment of the GOES to the rule of law is seen as an endorsement of the legitimacy of the government.

(B) As the military are the primary focus for criticism, Pastor appears to have made a special effort to praise the performance of the military and the public security forces, noting that they are not in any way officially connected with what little rightist inspired violence that may remain;

(C) On questions related to observance of the Geneva Conventions and protocols thereto, Pastor criticizes the FMLN/FDR, not the GOES, saying the guerrillas misuse of civilian supporters and its indiscriminate land mine warfare constitute serious violations of international norms;

(D) On statistical accuracy, he questions Tutela legal's (the Catholic Church's human rights organization) methodology, calling it based on presumptions, not facts.

The GOES accepts as accurate his criticisms of the judicial system and the need to reform the legal code to deal with security prisoners.

The FMLN/FDR is incensed by Pastor's report and is questioning its objectivity. End summary.

3. Dr. Jose Antonio Pastor Ridruejo, United Nations special rapporteur for human rights in El Salvador, submitted his report "on the situation of human rights in El Salvador" to the United Nations third committee on October 21, 1986. Pastor's first report was presented to the United Nations Human Rights Commission in March 1982. Since then Dr. Pastor has visited El Salvador each September, submitting his preliminary report to the third committee each fall and his final report to the UNHRC each spring. In 1986 Pastor, an internationally respected Spanish jurist, visited El Salvador September 21-27, and met also with interested parties in New York. Throughout the year, both the Government of El Salvador and The FMLN/FDR guerrilla front provided Pastor with information. The following is a summary of Dr. Pastor's preliminary report for 1986. If past reports are any guideline, he will make only minor modifications before presenting it as the definite report to The UNHRC meeting in Geneva in spring 1987. While we do not agree entirely with each of Pastor's conclusions, we believe that his is the most objective assessment of human rights in El Salvador written by an outside human rights expert. The report itself was submitted in Spanish and we understand that the UN does not plan to translate the report until it is submitted to the UNHRC meeting.

4. Note: Large portions of the report dealing with agrarian reform and the economy have been omitted from the following excerpts. We have also omitted the conclusion section which repeats much of the excerpts we have selected:

5. Begin excerpts:

I. General political situation

There has been greater respect for human rights during 1986. A state of siege remains in force suspending freedom of movement,

freedom of expression, and freedom of correspondence.

II. Economic, social, and cultural rights

After citing in lengthy detail information about the state of the economy, land reform, and the labor situation, the special rapporteur turns to guerrilla sabotage of the economy. He cites Salvadoran governmental human rights commission statistics that in the period from September 1985 to June 1986 the guerrillas initiated 50 attacks against public and private transport including machine-gunning, fire bombing, and dynamiting. In addition the guerrillas declared five transportation stoppages. Other guerrilla targets were cooperatives, farms, crop dusters, banks, private residences. There were 15 attacks against towns or villages. Five phone company offices were attacked, 4 city halls, 2 court houses, 3 schools, and the National Census Office was burned.

The National electric company reported that during the same period of time, it suffered 1035 guerrilla actions against its installations including the destruction of 66 high tension towers, 541 posts, 45 transformers and two substations. Two electric company workers were seriously wounded when they sought to repair a downed tower which the guerrillas had rigged with a mine. Total loss to the electric company of equipment totaled over 19 million dollars.

The special rapporteur cites the August 27, 1986, International Herald Tribune that "rebel violations include an increasing number of summary executions, attacks on road traffic, dozens of kidnappings and the indiscriminate use of land mines, which probably kill and wound many more civilians than does bombardment by the (Salvadoran) army."

In the conclusion of the report the special rapporteur once again calls attention to the fact that the systematic guerrilla attacks against the economic infrastructure gravely endanger the present and future enjoyment by the Salvadoran citizenry of important economic, social, and cultural rights.

III. Civil and political rights

Assassinations: Pastor warns that one must "proceed with extreme prudence" in examining the number of assassinations because of methodological differences between sources of information and because of the difficulty of investigating the deaths, especially in the conflictive zones. After citing figures from various organizations including the U.S. Embassy, Pastor notes that "the special rapporteur believes that at present commanders and high-ranking officers do not help or protect" the death squads. The report notes that despite the different figures given by different sources, "there exists among them an important point of coincidence: The number of political assassinations committed by agents of the state and perhaps paramilitary groups linked to the extreme right in 1986 is manifestly less than in 1985, which confirms the downward trend which was initiated in June 1984 when Jose Napoleon Duarte was inaugurated as President. The special rapporteur stresses the continuance of the downward trend while expressing the hope and desire that summary executions be completely eliminated in the shortest time possible."

Arrests and disappearances: The report notes that with regard to arrests and disappearances one must use great circumspection in evaluating the figures. As of September 23, 1986, there were 76 women incarcerated under the terms of decree 50 (which covers subversive activity) as compared to 44

one year previously, and 972 decree 50 prisoners in the men's prison as opposed to 462 in 1985.

Noting that the number of decree 50 prisoners has increased, "the special representative does not deny, of course, the right of the Salvadoran authorities to proceed legally against those attempting by force of arms to overthrow the constitutional order; his concern is centered on applying to such individuals a law as criticized as decree 50, whose long deadlines are not even met."

Treatment of political prisoners: citing information from a number of sources and testimony from individual prisoners, Pastor concludes that harsh psychological pressure is applied during the extrajudicial interrogation of some decree 50 prisoners. He notes that sources indicate that between 15 and 20 percent of political prisoners are psychologically abused although he "does not believe that it constitutes a deliberate and systematic practice by Salvadoran authorities."

State of the Salvadoran criminal justice system: After listing a number of unresolved high-profile cases which "demonstrate at the very least an anomalous slowness and high index of inactivity in the functioning of the Salvadoran criminal justice," he notes that ordinary Salvadorans deserve the same attention: "From the point of view of the rule of law all cases must merit identical treatment and interest as is required by the principle of equal justice under the law."

After reviewing data provided by the Salvadoran armed forces of soldiers turned over to the courts for prosecution, he concludes that all or almost all the cases involve common crimes and not violations of human rights committed with political motives.

The work of the Salvadoran justice system with regard to grave violations of human rights is "... highly unsatisfactory. While it is true that criminal investigations are initiated in all or almost all cases the impression is that these investigations advance at an extraordinarily slow pace and encounter almost insurmountable barriers to convictions, propitiating a harmful climate of impassivity."

According to the Salvadoran authorities, the obstacles to an adequately functioning justice system are: (1) Insufficient pay for judges and prosecutors, especially at lower levels; (2) lack of means to carry out investigations; (3) psychological pressure on the judges, many of whom were assassinated or threatened in previous years; (4) witnesses' fear of testifying in cases with political implications; (5) intimidated jurors; (6) legislation and procedures inadequate to the present climate of violence; and (7) destruction of courthouses and court records in the conflictive zones.

Violations of human and political rights attributed to the guerrillas: The special rapporteur, after cautioning that one must exercise the same circumspection when evaluating information received in this field as in evaluating that received about offenses committed by government forces, cites figures from various sources of the number of persons killed outside combat by the guerrillas, the number of persons kidnapped for political reasons by the guerrillas—here he rebukes the guerrillas for not having permitted the international committee of the Red Cross to visit Col. Omar Napoleon Avalos, held by the guerrillas since October 26, 1985. (Department note: Avalos has since been released in an exchange for wounded and imprisoned guerrillas); the guerrillas finally permitted the ICRC to visit Avalos in

October 1986—and casualties suffered by the civilian population during FMLN-declared "traffic stoppages."

IV. Situation of refugees and the displaced

Referring to operation "Phoenix" carried out by the Salvadoran Armed Forces against the guerrilla redoubt on Guazapa Volcano in January and February 1986, and the forcible evacuation of civilian followers of the guerrillas, the report notes that based upon "article 17 of additional protocol II of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, the removals (from Guazapa) were allowed insofar as the security of the civilians required it Given the reality of the war, the suffering experienced by the civil population affected by these removals is less than that which would have been caused them as a consequence of combat if they were to have continued living in the conflictive zones."

V. Human rights and the armed conflict

Regarding civilian deaths as a consequence of combat, the special rapporteur notes that "presumptions play an important role in the methodology" of Tutela Legal, the archdiocesan human rights office. He notes that Tutela Legal figures for civilians "presumably" killed by the army in combat includes combatants and "constitutes a presumption." (Americas Watch relies almost exclusively on Tutela Legal for its statistics).

Regarding the "Masas" or civilian followers of the guerrillas, the special rapporteur notes that it is often difficult to distinguish between the Masas and the guerrilla combatants. To the extent that the Masas do not take part in combat they should be considered civilian population. However, he notes that with some frequency people belonging to the "Masas" participate for periods of time in actions inconsistent with their role as civilians. He reports talking with a young woman who told him that she not only traveled with the guerrillas but provided supplies and helped them transport ammunition. He notes that this last activity deprives Masas of their identity as civilians. He concludes that the "line between combatants and noncombatants can at times be imprecise. This should not be construed to mean the special rapporteur is affirming the legitimacy of attacking the Masas. . . . The active participation of the Masas in combat against the army, however exceptional and circumstantial it may be, can in fact motivate the harassment of the Masas and definitely result in some civilian victims caused occasionally by the army such as incidental damage to their property."

The special rapporteur believes that one of the reasons for the dramatic decline in the number of civilian victims caused by the ESAF is the removal from conflictive zones of the civilian population.

"The regular Salvadoran Army is conducting the war in a much more humanitarian manner at present than in the past and has been able to drastically reduce the number of civilian victims."

With regard to mines, the special rapporteur states his special concern and notes detailed information given him by the governmental human rights commission concerning 69 civilians killed and 208 gravely wounded during the previous year. "The generalized opinion picked up by the special rapporteur from independent sources is that the immense majority of mines killing or wounding noncombatants had been placed by the guerrillas. For his part, Reporter James Lemoyne wrote in August 1986: "Although both the army and the leftist guer-

rillas use land mines, the majority of civilian casualties appear to be caused by guerrilla land mines, according to several villagers and to leading human rights officials." This is the opinion of the special rapporteur as well."

VI. Concern of the GOES with human rights

In his 1986 visit, the special rapporteur reconfirmed that the GOES "remains firmly committed" to "respect for human rights, a concern which is noted in the process of democratic normalization, which is gradually and progressively bearing welcome results."

With regard to judicial reform, "the special rapporteur reiterates his opinion that the judicial reform project is serious and testifies to the progress of its components, although he once again points out that its effects will be felt in the Salvadoran reality in the medium and long term, particularly since the goal is precisely to change mind sets and civic habits, changes which cannot be achieved overnight."

The special rapporteur understands definitely that the constitutional authorities of the republic of El Salvador are persisting in their efforts to improve the human rights observance within the process of political normalization; efforts, it is correct to say, which increasingly have resonance in the Salvadoran reality, particularly in the crucial terrain of respect for the life of civilians, both outside and as a result of combat."

VIII. Recommendations

"The special representative recommends in particular to the constitutional authorities in El Salvador:

(A) The prompt removal of legislation incompatible with international standards of human rights and the adoption of norms compatible with those standards, especially in the prosecution of political crimes;

(B) The continuation and intensification of control of extrajudicial interrogation of political prisoners in order to adjust to the aforementioned standards;

(C) The continuation and deepening of judicial reform and agrarian reform. . . ."

The special rapporteur recommends especially to the forces of the FMLN:

(A) Refraining from locating mines which can kill or injure the physical integrity of the noncombatant population.

(B) Refraining from attacking the economic infrastructure in El Salvador.

(C) "Finally the special rapporteur recommends to all nations in the international community, particularly the wealthier and more developed, that within their possibilities they give necessary aid to provide relief and improve the conditions of life of those Salvadoran citizens who are refugees or displaced as a consequence of the conflict."

EL SALVADOR: 1,596 VICTIMS OF GUERRILLA LAND MINE WARFARE AWAITING TREATMENT

Indiscriminate use of land mines by the Salvadoran guerrillas united in the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN), joined politically with the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR), has resulted in the loss of one or more limbs by approximately 1,596 individuals who are currently awaiting assistance from the private and/or military rehabilitation facilities. Of the amputees, about 943 military personnel are awaiting rehabilitation (some 250 have already been fitted with prostheses). Approximately 653 civilians who have survived land mine explosions are awaiting assistance. Of this total, estimates are that be-

tween one-quarter to one-third are children under the age of 15. Many of these children live in rural areas and have not received medically appropriate amputations.

In the first seven months of 1986, a total of 393 soldiers and 172 civilians lost one or more limbs. This rate is triple that for the same period in 1985 and is, to date, double the total for all 1985 as well. In June and July of this year, 48 civilians (including 15 children) suffered amputations and nine civilians (including four children) died as a result of land mines. The military estimate that there have been 768 mine incidents involving military personnel so far in 1986 (through September 10). On the average, one of every four soldiers wounded in action is wounded as a result of contact with a land mine. On the average 50 percent of all military land mine casualties lose a limb. (July 1986: total wounded in action—199; wounded in contact—113; wounded by mines—86; amputations—38.)

Deaths due to land mines are increasing exponentially. Civilians killed due to mines: 1984, 31; 1985, 55; 1986 through July, 53. Military killed due to mines: 1984, 47; 1985, 85, 1986, 76 (through July).

In addition to the up to 1,596 individuals awaiting rehabilitative treatment, each day a greater number of individuals are added to the waiting lists. Current estimates are that between 20-25 civilians and 50-60 members of the armed forces per month are surviving land mine explosions with the loss of one or more limbs; at this rate, approximately 970 individuals will lose one or more limbs this year.

While the government of El Salvador has issued strict rules of engagement regulating protection of the civilian populace from aerial bombardment, no similar restraints are being exercised by the FMLN/FDR. Mines are being deliberately placed in farm areas and in places frequented by civilians. Guerrilla radio broadcasts openly acknowledge responsibility for indiscriminate land mine warfare declaring it to be an integral part of their revolutionary strategy.

The recently established military rehabilitation facility (the Center for Professional Rehabilitation of the Armed Forces, CERPROFA) produces 45 prosthetic devices per month (540 per year), projected to increase to 60 devices per month by end-1986. A U.S. Army medical humanitarian mobile training team is assisting CERPROFA to establish a program to make prosthetic devices and set up rehabilitation facilities. In FY 1986, the USG provided over \$400,000 from U.S. military assistance programs to CERPROFA. \$700,000 will be provided in FY 1987. These funds are part of a basic program to train Salvadoran prosthetists and orthotists to make El Salvador self-sufficient in the long run in rehabilitation capability. Due to the large backlog of amputees and the increasing number of victims, CERPROFA and the U.S. Army medical group are seeking direct assistance from commercial firms in the U.S. and are contracting with private rehabilitation specialists to assist the ongoing CERPROFA program. CERPROFA can only provide prosthetic limbs and rehabilitation to members of the armed forces.

The Salvadoran Civilian Rehabilitation Institute (ISRI), able to produce only 12-15 devices per year, is overwhelmed by the increasing numbers of civilian amputees (172 civilians have lost limbs to date in 1986, and projected total civilian victims in 1986 is 297.) For those 153 civilians who have signed up with ISRI for rehabilitation and are able to pay the \$120-300, the wait will

be 3-4 years at a minimum. For many, however, the cost is too great, and they will continue to walk only with the use of crutches and homemade wooden or plaster legs. In addition, an estimated 328 additional victims are distributed throughout El Salvador, with many in remote villages. In the first quarter of 1986, civilian mine incidents were recorded in 11 of the 14 departments, concentrated in Usulután—19 killed or wounded; San Miguel, 17; San Vicente, 11; 2 in Morazan, and 5 in Chalatenango.

The U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) has recently signed a \$280,000 grant agreement with ISRI to begin developing a rehabilitation infrastructure for civilian land mine victims. The AID program will assist ISRI improve and expand its programs. Additional assistance to ISRI to establish a vocational training program is being planned by CARE Germany to begin later this year. However, this long-term program will not immediately address the needs of the 653 civilians now awaiting rehabilitation assistance. Efforts are underway to identify charitable organizations willing to address the rehabilitation needs of El Salvador's civilian land mine victims.

The Salvadoran government and private sector are attempting to redress this national crisis through limited domestic resources. The private "20/30 Club" devoted its last telethon to raising funds to establish two regional rehabilitation centers in Santa Ana and San Miguel. These centers were opened in mid-July, each with 2 or 3 prosthetic technicians, but they will only slightly increase the domestic production of artificial limbs.

Unfortunately, while all of these efforts will result in improved rehabilitation services in the long term, none of these ongoing efforts provides an immediate solution for the 1,596 civilians and military personnel currently waiting for prosthetic devices and rehabilitation assistance. While the Salvadoran government is seeking agreement from the FMLN/FDR to "humanize" the war, there is currently no indication that the guerrillas will cease indiscriminate land mine warfare.

EL SALVADOR—GUERRILLA LAND MINE CASUALTIES

Military and civilian casualties	Civilian	Military	Total
Amputees:			
1984-86 (YTD)	1,653	1,193	
1986 (Jan.-July)	172	393	565
1986 Monthly average	25	56	82
1986 June and July (15 children.)			
Deaths:			
1984	31	47	78
1985	55	85	140
1986 (Jan.-July)	53	76	129

¹ Prior to 1985 no statistics were kept by GOES. Estimate total military amputees now at 1,193 (800 1982-85, plus 393 to date in 1986).

NUMBER OF MILITARY WOUNDED IN JUNE/JULY

Month	Wounded in contact	Per-cent	Wounded by mines	Per-cent	Mine victims who lost limbs	Total wounded in action
June	136	63	80	37	57	216
July	113	57	86	43	38	199

Note: 1 of every 4 soldiers wounded in action is wounded as a result of contact with a land mine. 1 out of every 5 soldiers wounded loses a limb.

REHABILITATION
CERPROFA: MILITARY REHABILITATION
INSTITUTE

MILGP MTT:

Prostheses Production: Current; 45/
month—END CY86: 80/month.

Total 1193 Amputees Fitted: 250 (esti-
mate).

Total Awaiting Rehabilitation: 943 (1193
minus 250).

Total To Be Fitted 1987: 720 (at 60/
month).¹

Projected Amputees 1987: 732 (62/
month).²

Footnotes at end of table.

Assistance Level—MAP: FY86 \$400,000 FY
87 \$700,000.

ISRI: SALVADORAN REHABILITATION INSTITUTE.

AID/PVO's:

Prostheses Production: Current; 15/yr
Projected: NA.

Total 653 Amputees Fitted: 0.

Total Awaiting Rehabilitation: 653.

ISRI Confirmed Waiting List: 153; 325.

1986 Survivors-to-Date List: 172.

Not on ISRI Waiting List: 328 (est).

Total Civilian Amputees (1982-YTD): 653.

Total To Be Fitted 1987: NA.

Projected Amputees 1987: 300.

Assistance Level:

AID: FY 86, \$0; FY87, \$280,000.

PVO's: FY 86, \$0; FY87, \$230,000.³

¹ Not all casualties will be medically ready for
prostheses.

² Straightline projection based on rate-of-growth
of mine victims over 18 month period.

³ Under discussion.

A DIRTY WAR IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Frederick Downs, Jr.)

(Frederick Downs, Jr. has written two
books about his experiences in Vietnam,
"The Killing Zone" and "Aftermath." He is
a health-care professional specializing in
the disabled.)

The Government of El Salvador has been
winning the war against its communist guer-
rillas. In desperation, the communists have
indiscriminately used land mines against
both the military and civilian population.

I recently returned from El Salvador,
where I helped set up a program for ampu-
tees. Communist mines have blown one or
more limbs off about 1,600 people, 950 mili-
tary and 650 civilian. Of the civilians, it's es-
timated that a quarter to a third are chil-
dren.

This catastrophe results from a guerrilla
program of deliberately mining farm areas
and places frequented by civilians. Guerrilla
radio broadcasts acknowledge responsibility
for indiscriminate land-mine warfare, de-
claring it an integral part of their revolu-
tionary strategy.

The guerrillas intend to continue this
strategy, as evidenced in a New York Times
article headlined "Salvador Rebel Defends
the Use of Land Mines." Guerrilla leader
Shafik Handal said: "The use of land mines
is a very important weapon for us." He
added: "The mines cripple rather than kill
their victims. . . . They leave the soldier in a
condition so he can live and take up another
line of work."

Contrast this with the situation in Nicara-
gua. Last July, articles in The New York
Times and The Washington Post recounted
a land-mine incident in which civilians were
killed in Jinotega Province, and charges by
the Sandinistas that civilians had been
killed by mines in other parts of the coun-
try. Both sides blamed each other. While
skepticism rages about these incidents, it is

important to point out that neither side has
an avowed policy to kill and maim civilians
with land mines. Tragically, this is not the
case in El Salvador.

Estimates are that 20 to 25 civilians and
50 to 60 soldiers per month survive land-
mine explosions with the loss of one or
more limbs. They sometimes must wait for
years to get an artificial limb under the
country's minimal prosthetic program.

This violence is significant for two major
reasons. First, the maiming and terrorizing
of civilians is specifically aimed at demoral-
izing the government and eroding the peo-
ple's faith in its ability to protect them and
to provide care for them—a tactic used very
effectively by the communists in Vietnam.
Second, military strategists know it is better
to severely wound an enemy than to kill
him, because a wounded man draws many
more resources from his country. I had
some experience with this in Vietnam and
as an amputee in an Army hospital for a
year.

Both of these points became much more
meaningful to me as I went through the
routine of a day in El Salvador.

The U.S. Army Mobile Medical Training
Team had helped the El Salvadoran mili-
tary build a modern prosthetic laboratory
and was training the El Salvadorans to be
self-sufficient as prosthetists. We were
asked to see if we find ways to speed up the
fabrication of artificial limbs.

A tour of the military hospital in San Sal-
vador provided an excellent refresher of
what war wounds do to people and to the
health-care system.

In the emergency operating room, we saw
a soldier who had been shot in the abdomen
while on patrol. He had been in the emer-
gency room for over a half hour but the
resident had not been able to do anything.
He did not want to start surgery without a
surgeon to back him up, and none was avail-
able. When we left the hospital after about
45 minutes, a backup physician had yet to
show up. (In 1983 El Salvador had about
three doctors for every 10,000 people; the
ratio is presumed to be even lower now.)

There were 450 patients in this 375-bed
hospital. Sanitary conditions were primitive.
The hospital had a 50 percent surgical infec-
tion rate.

We saw soldiers who had been blinded by
booby-traps and mines being led by friends
to a clock on the wall. One soldier who had
been blinded the longest was teaching the
others how to tell time by feeling the clock's
hands.

There was no program to rehabilitate the
blind and no equipment to help them regain
a degree of mobility and independence.
There were no white canes, braille writers
or braille watches.

There were large numbers of amputees.
The probable reasons were delays in being
taken to care stations, contamination of
wounds and faulty surgical techniques. Of
course, the biggest reason of all was the
guerrillas' increased use of land mines.

What we did not see were the casualties
who had not made it back to the hospitals—
those who had died. Out in the rural areas
where the guerrillas hit the people the
hardest, the system for evacuating civilian
casualties is pathetically inadequate or non-
existent. A casualty is dependent on family
or friends to carry him to a road where
transportation can be gotten to a hospital.

The guerrillas has taken a toll other than
combat injuries. Medical facilities have been
closing, and health personnel fear for their
lives. In 1983, the guerrillas assassinated the

director and head nurse of Chalatenango
Hospital. At Usuluton Hospital the guerril-
las assassinated two residents, leaving the
other four to wonder if they would be next.

Assassination of government officials or
anyone connected to the government is an
acceptable guerrilla tactic. Many wounded
soldiers are afraid to return home for fear
they will be killed.

The lack of support systems in such criti-
cal areas as pharmaceutical and medical
supplies, including drug quality control,
maintenance (buildings, vehicles, biomedical
equipment) and information is increasingly
debilitating.

When all of this is taken into account, it
becomes easier to understand how the indis-
criminate use of land mines adds a terrible
drain to the resources of an already poor
country. The comment that by crippling
rather than killing, mines "leave a soldier in
a condition so he can live and take up an-
other line of work" becomes hideously ridi-
culous.

I will quote from some of the things
from the rapporteur's report:

As the existence of a special rapporteur
has become a political issue used by the left
to question the legitimacy of the Duarte
government, his praise of human rights
progress and commitment of the Govern-
ment of El Salvador to the rule of law is
seen as an endorsement of the legitimacy of
that government.

As the military are the primary focus for
criticism by some groups, Pastor, the Rap-
porteur, appears to have made a special
effort to praise the performance of the mili-
tary and the public security forces, noting
that they are not in any way officially con-
nected with what little rightist-inspired vio-
lence that may remain.

On questions related to observance of the
Geneva conventions and protocols, he criti-
cizes the guerrillas, not the Government of
El Salvador, saying the guerrillas' misuse of
civilian supporters and its indiscriminate
land mine warfare constitutes serious viola-
tions of international norms.

While I was in El Salvador, I had the
opportunity to speak and to address
the American Chamber of Commerce
there, and I would like to include in
the RECORD a copy of the remarks that
I made at that time to that group.

The following is an address made to
the American Chamber of Commerce
in El Salvador on Friday, March 6,
1987, at the request of the United
States Ambassador to El Salvador
Edwin Corr.

ONE CONGRESSMAN'S VIEW OF UNITED STATES-
EL SALVADOR RELATIONS

Ambassador Corr, members of the board
of directors of the American chamber, ladies
and gentlemen:

(1) It is a great pleasure for me to be with
you today. I am traveling through Central
America with a delegation of United States
Congressmen, headed by George Crockett,
the new chairman of the Western Hemi-
sphere Affairs Subcommittee of the House
Foreign Affairs Committee. We are looking
at this area that is so close to us, so impor-
tant to U.S. interests and so troubled by eco-
nomic difficulties, conflicts and threats
from Marxist-Leninist guerrillas and totali-
tarian governments. I have followed events
in this beautiful but beleaguered country
for many years now. I have visited your
country before and have developed friend-

ships here which I cherish. I would like to take this opportunity to tell you how a Congressman and member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—who is also a Republican and the Congressman in whose district lives the President of the United States views the changes in your country in recent years.

I can tell you firsthand about Ronald Reagan's continuing strong support for El Salvador.

(2) Today all but one of the countries of this isthmus are democracies. The United States supports these nations in their efforts to consolidate and protect their democracies. Notice that I said "the United States supports" these democracies. I did not say, "republicans" or "democrats." Although I must tell you that there is an effort now being made to stop assistance, particularly military aid.

There is not even a major dispute in the Congress about the nature of the Government in Nicaragua.

Only a relative handful of Members support the Sandinista Communist Government of Nicaragua.

As a matter of fact, in the last 20 or so hours of floor debate last held on the issue of aid to the Contras, all who spoke agreed:

(1) The Sandinista Communist Government is repressive to the people, in violation of the promises made in 1979 to the U.S. and the O.A.S. and is a threat to its neighbors; and

(2) The United States should do something about it. There was, of course, great disagreement about what to do, with the majority finally voting to provide \$100 million in economic and military aid.

(3) Consolidation of democracy. Since 1982, you have held four elections under the watchful—and sometimes suspicious—eyes of hundreds of journalists and official observers from around the world. I observed both Presidential elections. The overwhelming majority of those observers including me and the now Speaker of the House Jim Wright declared those elections to be open, fair and honest. These elections gave meaning to your obvious desire to political freedom and, I might add, helped enormously those of us in the United States Congress who wanted to continue and increase aid to El Salvador in face of severe criticism from the left.

Just to show how important the elections were, we won a very important vote on military assistance by 2 votes shortly thereafter. There is no doubt in my mind that we would have lost had not President Duarte lobbied the Congress.

I know there are people here who are dissatisfied with your government's policies, especially its economic policies. I have some of the same reservations.

However, having said that it is vital that the issue be handled in a constructive way so as not to assist those who wish to destroy democracy in El Salvador.

I intend to take up this matter with President Duarte when we meet with him.

What is important is that in a democracy you can complain with no fear of repression.

And you do have elections to offer policy alternatives.

One of the most important and personally gratifying democratic developments has been the attitude of the armed forces.

Their commitment to constitutional democracy under the leadership of Defense Minister Vedes Casanova is increasingly evident. The improved professionalism of the Salvadoran military has drawn the support

and respect of the people and the attention of the United States Congress.

(4) Human rights. El Salvador became front page news in the United States in the late 1970's and early 1980's when we were barraged with stories of barbarous human rights violations. You all know that there has been great progress in the past seven years. Deaths from political violence in El Salvador have decreased remarkably. Death squads are no longer active. Most of the political violence today comes from the FMLN. The FMLN's indiscriminate use of mines has killed and maimed innocent civilians throughout the country. The FMLN machine guns passing trucks and buses. This is the primary human rights violation in the country today. Civilian deaths from political violence now number about 22 a month instead of the hundreds of several years ago. The United States is committed to doing everything it can to help Salvadorans assure and protect their human rights. No other issue receives as much attention in Congress as human rights. Continued improvement will be vital to maintain U.S. support for El Salvador.

5. Administration of justice. No particular area is more important to the protection of human rights than the administration of justice. The rule of law, applied equally and regardless of position, wealth or power, is a cornerstone of democracy. Salvadorans must be able to see that police forces are efficient, law-abiding and humane, that criminals are arrested, that trials are speedy and fair, that judges and juries are free of intimidation, that jails are not packed with persons waiting years for trials. There is a long way to go here.

The best legal minds in the world can be stifled if the laws and legal administrative machinery don't work. The United States is assisting the Government of El Salvador to improve the administration of justice. The goal is to assure that every citizen has the fullest protection of the law. We in the Congress will watch this program closely.

Since 1974 the United States Government has been prevented by law from providing training and assistance to police, a restriction that I personally opposed. For the past year, under a waiver to this law that Congress has provided we have been able to provide limited amount of assistance and training to the Salvadoran police forces. I support this program and will continue to do so because it is vital to assuring democracy. Not all of my colleagues agree. The best way to convince them is to show success.

6. Conduct of war. Since the so-called final offensive of the FMLN in 1981, we have seen an increasingly professional Salvadoran Armed Forces, capable of carrying the war to the guerrillas anywhere in El Salvador. The guerrilla's "final offensive" of January 1981 failed because the people of El Salvador did not support the guerrillas. The "intervention" in Salvadoran affairs accelerated greatly after the Sandinistas took over in Nicaragua. At that time the United States had suspended all military aid to El Salvador and began generously to contribute to the Sandinistas. The Sandinistas meanwhile poured arms and munitions into El Salvador to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation (FMLN) guerrilla groups, many of whose leaders had already received training in Cuba, Vietnam and East European countries. When I visited Managua in 1979 and 1985, the Sandinistas [dissembled] when asked about their aid to the FMLN. As a matter of fact, a high ranking Sandinista official told us that while they were

not helping the Salvador guerrillas they would stop if we would stop helping the Contras!

Since that time, the tide of battle has turned more and more against the FMLN. The major factors behind this trend are declining popular support for the FMLN, the professionalization of the Salvadoran Armed Forces and their change in comportment, and United States support. The level of full-time FMLN combatants has been reduced from near 12,000 in 1983 to perhaps 5,000 today.

7. Contadora negotiations and the search for peace. The view that the United States Government has rejected negotiations as a means to resolve conflicts in Central America is erroneous. There are those who believe that the Contadora process has failed because of the United States' influence over Central American governments. This is a distorted view of America's power and a lack of appreciation for Central American leaders' sense of pride, independence, and judgment. The Central American leaders believe that a bad treaty is worse than none at all.

It is not politic for larger Latin American countries to impose unsatisfactory solutions on the Central American democracies in the name of "Latin American solidarity." When Central American democratic leaders act independently in pursuit of their own nation's national interests, and these actions coincide with interests of the United States, that leaders is branded a puppet of the U.S. I give special praise to President Duarte for defending the true interests of his country and for his firm stand against Sandinista pressure and that of certain supposedly friendly countries who carry water for the FSLN.

The position of the United States on Contadora has been full support for a comprehensive, verifiable, simultaneously implementable treaty. The Reagan administration believes that a solution cannot be imposed on the Central Americans either by the United States or by other governments. I believe that I and the majority of U.S. Congressmen support that position. Many of us also support the goals and objectives of the plan of Costa Rican President Arias.

The position of the United States Government on dialogue between the Government of El Salvador and the FMLN-FDR has been and is in favor of it. The FMLN has only about 5,000 combatants, a decreasing number of active supporters, no territory under permanent control and only terrorism and violence as its claims to legitimacy. The Government, on the other hand, was elected by a million and a half citizens in elections declared to be open, fair and honest by international observers, and newsmen. The principal subjects, it seems to me, for negotiations revolve around the incorporation of the FMLN-FDR into the existing constitutional system. Congressional elections are slated again for 1988 and Presidential elections for 1989; this offers the opportunity for incorporation of the rank and file of the FMLN into the economic and social life of the country. FMLN-FDR leaders should disavow violence and seek by peaceful constitutional means to achieve their goals.

8. The economy. From 1979 to 1982, El Salvador suffered a 23-percent decline in its gross national product. In 1980 there was a negative nine percent growth rate. By 1984 the country was showing a slightly positive growth rate and has continued at that level. The country expended 42 percent of its export earnings on debt payments in 1985. Salvadoran exports in 1987 will be half what

they were in 1979. Finally the Salvadoran economy was badly hurt by capital flight during the 1970's and 1980's, and as long as the war continues, the return of capital will be slow. The challenge is to move to solid growth with a consequent increase in employment, and to a more equitable distribution of wealth. The economy is the area currently most requiring progress for the consolidation of constitutional democracy in El Salvador.

The embassy calculates that since 1980 the FMLN has cost the country nearly two billion dollars, or roughly the same amount as all U.S. Government economic assistance during the same time frame. Falling commodity prices have also been a problem. The tragic earthquake has exacerbated the already serious situation.

Thus the essential task of improving employment and production is formidable. There is hope for a stronger economic performance. Economic adjustments including greater reliance on free enterprise are needed to stimulate exports and to lower the rate of inflation. Adjustment is never popular but if delayed the situation will only get worse. With proper policies, including justice and the training of this country's ample and hard working labor force, El Salvador returned to economic growth and prosperity.

9. The United States Aid Program. The U.S. Assistance Program both military and political for each of the last two years has been about 450 million dollars. United States aid programs are in support of Salvadoran agrarian reform, judicial reform, education, health, private sector growth, and delivering goods and services to citizens in conflictive areas in order that the benefits of constitutional democracy can be appreciated by all Salvadorans.

During FY 1985 we provided over 320 million dollars for economic and social development and about 120 million dollars for military assistance. The comparable figures for FY 1986 were 311 million dollars and 121 million dollars. In FY 1987, owing to the earthquake, the U.S. economic and assistance programs will increase substantially. As you know, the Congress voted, 50 million dollars in earthquake assistance last year and we have an additional 100 million dollars pending before us now. We are proud of our efforts to help Salvadorans committed to democracy to establish and maintain a constitutional government.

10. Conclusion. I and most of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress are determined to strive to comprehend the reality of Central America, to live up to our ideals and defend our and your national security interests. We will provide sufficient support to help the true democrats of this region to institutionalize democratic systems and thereby offer a better life to their peoples.

You may rest assured that in BOB LAGOMARSINO you have a friend and supporter in the U.S. Congress.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, we also met with various human rights organizations in El Salvador. One of them was the organization called Tutela Legal, which is associated with the Catholic Church there.

They did say that the human rights situation was not as good as what I have described to you. However, even they admitted that there had been considerable progress in the human rights area that the government oper-

ations were far better than they had been and the lady who talked to us on behalf of Tutela Legal was not able to explain why the U.N. Special Rapporteur criticized their methodology.

We also met with the attorney general, who pointed out to us some of the problems with judicial reform, some of the reasons why it's not moving as fast as it should, and giving us some idea of what was going to happen in the future.

We had a very interesting conversation with four guerrilla defectors, and I will put their remarks in brief in the record as well.

The summaries follow:

Four Guerrilla Defectors: (Michelle Salinas, Dora Angelica viuda de Joval, etc.)

SALINAS

She joined Salvador guerrillas in order to win a better life for her people through armed struggle.

Five guerrilla groups unite and form FMLN.

Salvador Committee of Mothers used to stress case of the many disappeared and political prisoners.

VIUDA DE JOVAL

She worked with non-government Human Rights Commission, a guerrilla front group, after her mother disappeared.

She altered Commission statistics concerning the number of troops/guerrillas killed.

The FMLN knew Americans were sensitive to the problems of the poor; funds from European groups given to Human Rights Commission were used by guerrillas to fight war.

THIRD EX-GUERRILLA (MAN):

He joined guerrillas because of human rights violations and institutionalized repression and lack of an alternative to solve these problems.

He received professional guerrilla training in El Salvador by Sandinista instructors in '80 and later attacked the American Embassy, National Guard units, and military airport and destroyed many aircraft.

Guerrillas in early 1980's were hopeful that a broad-based insurrection would occur.

He also trained in Nicaragua and Cuba and some targets were bridges, microwave relay stations.

He disagreed with new guerrilla strategy to shift forces to west and disperse.

MARCO ANTONIO GRANDE: FOURTH EX-GUERRILLA

Was recruited by Communist Party while a student at University and received scholarship to USSR.

In '82, since he did not like Soviet Union and the Marxist-Leninist theory he was studying, he was sent to Cuba for infantry training for guerrillas with other Latin Americans.

He received more training in Nicaragua and then went to El Salvador via Guatemala with false documentation.

He became unhappy with the destruction of the Salvador economy and how that contradicted with the thinking of a true revolutionary.

In past, Salvadoran soldiers equipment taken by guerrillas and used; now, army is better and insurgent equipment brought in from Nicaragua.

Guerrillas change strategy in '85 due to large losses, and now use land mines.

Mr. Speaker, one of the gentlemen that we talked to was recruited by the guerrillas in El Salvador; was instructed in Nicaragua, traveled to Cuba and was one of those who carried out the very effective attack on the Ilo Pongo Airport in El Salvador some several years ago, which practically wiped out the small air force the Salvadorans had at that time.

We talked to another guerrilla who was recruited by the Communist Party while a student at the university in San Salvador, and who received a scholarship in the U.S.S.R., and he went there for training.

He became unhappy with the destruction of the Salvadoran economy and felt that that contradicted the thinking of a true revolutionary, and he has since defected.

We met with others there, and then of course we went on to the country of Nicaragua. In Nicaragua, we found that the situation—at least I found the situation to be every bit as bad as I had felt it to be. We met with a number of people in the private sector, and we met with people in the Independent Human Rights Organization, who had been there before the Sandinistas took over.

We talked to high officials of the Catholic Church there.

When we arrived in Nicaragua, the first thing that we saw was a demonstration that had been called to mark International Women's Day, and to call attention to political prisoners in that country.

Ten people were arrested just before we got there, including Gilberto Quadra, who was scheduled to have lunch with us that day or the next day.

I later asked Vice President Sergio Ramirez to look into the matter and to ensure that Mr. Quadra was released, and I understand those arrested were released on Monday night, the day that we left.

High officials of the Catholic Church gave very poignant testimony to us. They said that the state of emergency in the country severely impacts on the abilities of various organizations to have activities, to gain access to information, and so forth.

They pointed out that the new constitution which has been so hailed by some people in this country and people around the world as evidence that Nicaragua is not a totalitarian state, pointed out that even if you accept the constitution for what it says, it was not in effect for even 1 day; I think it was about 4 hours before it was declared put aside.

One of the Catholic Church officials we met with told us that there may be 10,000 or more political prisoners in jail and many are living in terrible conditions without ever having had a

fair trial, and in some cases with no trial at all.

□ 1510

He said that medical facilities in the country are inadequate and that the educational system teaches pro-Communist-Socialist ideas and that all schools, including Catholic schools, must use government texts and follow government programs of some 25 hours per week.

He said that neighborhood watch committees which have been set up by the Sandinista Communists terrorize Nicaraguans who oppose the government's policies by organizing divine mobs or, as they call them, turbas divinas. He said that young men interested in joining the seminary to study for the priesthood must first show their military ID's.

I asked him what his people thought about the Contras. I did not ask him what he thought because I did not want to get him in trouble. But I asked him what his people thought.

He said, "They like them a lot, almost all of them."

As I mentioned a moment or so ago, we did meet with the Permanent Commission on Human Rights. The Commission started in 1977 for the promotion and defense of human rights. It started during the term of the dictator Somoza.

He said some members of the Commission have been jailed, exiled, and others have had their homes attacked by the divine mobs.

Some of their offices have been occupied by the military. He said they look into about 140 human rights cases per month which include disappearances, murders, and tortures.

He said that in 1986, 600 Nicaraguans were sentenced by the anti-Somoza people's tribunal, and every one of them was found guilty. Those sentenced to 5 years in prison have their property confiscated. This law has been very effectively used against opponents of the Sandinistas.

He said also that the Catholic Church continues to be persecuted, to including confiscating the church's printing presses, closing the radio station they had, harassing priests, expelling Bishop Vega and not allowing Father Carballo back in the country when he had left.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK. I appreciate much of what the gentleman says, but I ask him if he would, and I do not mean to divert him, and I will just ask this one question: The President has been very proud of the good relations he has had with the People's Republic of China. I wonder if he would, based on his experience here, tell me whether he thinks some of the same conditions he found

in Nicaragua are also present in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. They probably are.

Mr. FRANK. Well, the problem is, I guess, without in any way approving any of what the gentleman talks about, I do not understand why that becomes grounds for armed intervention in one case when the People's Republic of China, which to my mind is much more repressive, in fact the Roman Catholic Church, as the gentleman probably knows, is banned from China, it is not just a question of harassing it. How come the President can be so friendly and so proud of his relations with the People's Republic of China if conditions there are worse than the conditions the gentleman cites as the reasons for his policy in Nicaragua?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I think part of the reason is the pragmatic one, that of the relationship between us and vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and the practical political thing of where we often find ourselves with strange bedfellows, if you will, when we are engaged in warfare or in political opposition, just as in World War II we, at one point, were allies, so to speak, with the Soviet Union, against Hitler.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate his very forthright statement and his yielding to me and letting me in on his time. I would tend to agree with that. I will completely agree with it. The point I would make is it does seem to me, given that, that it would be better describing our policy vis-a-vis Nicaragua in those terms. I think it is hard to argue that the human rights aspect is a very important part of it when, as the gentleman suggests, when pragmatic interests of the United States dictate we would ally ourselves with people who would be in many cases more repressive.

So my point is simply that one's view of the human rights in Nicaragua, one way or the other—and I am very critical of what I see there, although perhaps less critical than the gentleman, but maybe not—but I do not think it would be reasonably advanced as a major reason for our policy there when we are in fact so supportive of countries which have worse human rights records. I think it is, as the gentleman says, the analysis of our national interests and the human rights aspect tends to be sort of a make-wave.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would only say that one reason that I take this special order and talk about some of the things that I have talked about is I think there is a feeling—I know some of my constituents do not believe that Nicaragua is violating or violates human rights. They do not believe that they are supporting subversives in other countries, although I think

practically every Member of this body does. In the some 25 hours of debate on this subject last year and this year, if I am not incorrect, I do not think one Member of the House stood up and defended the Nicaraguan Government. Some attacked more strongly, as I am doing now, than others, but I do not remember one Member who said anything other than that the Nicaraguan Government was very repressive of its people and probably was supporting and was a threat to its neighbors.

But in any event, we met also with a union leader who pointed out that the original Sandinista revolution was a democratic one calling for pluralism, a mixed economy and non-alignment. He said it has been betrayed. The Sandinistas essentially control the private sector, and this control over that sector has caused serious problems for the economy. The private sector is private in name only.

I might point out that members of the private sector with whom we met said exactly the same thing. When I asked them, well, how come the government officials with whom we talked say that the private part of the economy is some 60 percent, He said, it is not anywhere near that, unless you call just mere ownership of an asset private property. He says everything we buy, everything we sell has to go through the government, they control everything including wages, prices, everything that we buy or not. And in any event that they do—they can and do confiscate our property, as did happen to the head of the private enterprise organization there. He said that the Contras, this union leader about whom I spoke, that the Contras are a product of the Sandinista failure and will continue if the Sandinistas do not change and return to the original revolution. He said, and this was interesting because it corresponded very closely with other information we had about this kind of opinion, he said that the draft, the rationing of food, unhappy businessmen have produced very negative effects on the Sandinistas and that they would win only about 30 percent of the votes if a free and fair election were held. We heard that their own private polls showed they would only win about 25 percent.

He pointed out, or he said, it was his opinion that the Sandinistas have neighborhood control of the society, block by block, which is something Somoza did not have, according to him.

We also met with a very courageous and charming lady, Violetta Chamorro, who was the wife of Pedro Joaquin Chamorro, whose death allegedly at the hands of the Somoza Government—there is some question about that—but anyway whose death led to the final revolution that over-

threw Somoza. She was a former member of the five-person junta and is the owner of La Prensa newspaper. She said that both she and her husband were used by the Sandinistas who later betrayed the original revolution which she supported. She said that La Prensa took an independent, line unlike the government newspaper, La Barricada, closed La Prensa after publishing for 61 years. She said there was a limited amount of food for the Nicaraguan people. She showed us her ration card. Even though the diplomatic stores have everything you could want. She said this situation was far worse than under Somoza. She said the Contras are real pressure, which, when combined with diplomatic and political pressure, may achieve some results in Nicaragua. She made it plain she does not necessarily support them.

In fact, she said the Contras issue has become a political asset for the Sandinistas because it is seen as struggle between Ortega and Reagan.

None of the nongovernment political parties in Nicaragua, interestingly, are associated with any socialist or Sandinista parties. All of the parties, and we met with six of them, supported the original revolution, but now they say, all of them, that they are being used and manipulated by the Sandinistas.

The opposition parties participated in the 1984 elections in order to preserve their groups as political organizations and they won a few seats in the national assembly. But the Sandinistas have two-thirds of the seats.

The constitution, this is what they are all telling us, the constitution of Nicaragua is a product of the Sandinista party that responds to the interests of the Sandinistas. It does include some concessions designed to satisfy international opinion. They said although the constitution talks about pluralism, a mixed economy and non-alignment, these are not carried through in the actual constitution itself.

One of the leaders of a respected and long-time political party in Nicaragua, one of the parties that strongly opposed Somoza during all of his rule, advised that his party attempted to withdraw from the election when he realized they would not be honest or fair.

□ 1520

The Sandinistas refused to allow him to withdraw, and as a matter of fact, talk about public financing of campaigns, campaigned for him, put ads in the newspapers and on television and everything else, put up election posters.

He told us, as a matter of fact, that they promised him a certain number of seats in the assembly—I do not know how they knew how the votes would turn out, but apparently they

did, if he would take part in the elections.

Although the opposition party representatives could not say publicly that they supported the Contras, they all agreed that the Democratic opposition was a viable form of pressure on the Sandinistas, but noted that the Sandinistas used the Contra issue to maintain the state of emergency.

You might say that some of them, certainly not all of them, thought that the Contras are a necessary evil. They did say—and one of the people with whom I spoke—and I certainly will not identify him for obvious reasons—said, "We used to be," and by that, he meant the nongovernment opposition, not only political but economic and so on, said, "We used to be public enemy No. 1. We are now public enemy No. 2. If the Contras disappear, we will become public enemy No. 1 again."

One interesting thing we heard—I do not know if it is accurate or not—but the people who told us certainly seemed to think it is, is that there are factions in the Sandinistas who do want a dialog and who do want to change their policies.

They said also, "Peace would be more dangerous than war." A rather interesting comment. The opposition parties would be banned. They pointed out that all revolutions are expansionist by nature, and the Sandinistas will influence the region.

The one thing that we heard a lot about throughout the area, in El Salvador as well as in Nicaragua, was that America must have a long-term policy for Central America; that we should try to arrive at a consensus and avoid changing direction every 2 years or so.

We did meet with a number of people in the Government, also. We met, for example, with a member of the National Assembly, who is a FSLN representative. We asked him what the position of the Nicaraguan Government was with relation to the proposal by President Arias of Costa Rica. A proposal had been made several weeks before we went down there.

We also asked that same question of Vice President Sergio Ramirez and of Victor Tenoka, the Vice Foreign Minister. Their answers, although basically the same, varied a little bit from, "We think it's an interesting proposal; we would like to fold that into Contadora."

Another said, "We will have our own proposal." One of them was quite critical of Costa Rica, saying that Costa Rica was not really a democracy, which I find interesting because it is, by all standards, the best and the oldest democracy in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, having just completed consideration of legislation dealing with aid to the Contras, it may be understandable that most Members will have turned their attention to other

pressing business. I believe, however, that we must not simply assume that aid to the Contras is behind us for 6 months and we can forget about it. In anticipation of the vote on the \$40 million, Time magazine published an essay entitled "Should the U.S. Support the Contras?" In the March 2, 1987, edition written by Charles Krauthammer. The commentary summarizes in the best, most concise form I have seen recently the rationale for the United States giving support to the Contras: "The failings, even the illegalities, of a President alter neither American strategic interests nor the morality—or immorality—of supporting anti-Communist rebels."

I urge my colleagues to read carefully this essay and consider the strategic interests of the United States in our efforts to support the Contras.

The essay follows:

SHOULD THE U.S. SUPPORT THE CONTRAS?

(By Charles Krauthammer)

Round 6, is it? President Reagan wants \$105 million from Congress for next year's aid for the Nicaraguan contras. Congressional Democrats are moving now to block \$40 million of this year's aid. We revisit the debate that will not die: Should the U.S. support the Nicaraguan resistance?

Congress is hardly the most finely honed instrument for making decisions of this kind. On the question of contra aid, Congress has returned answers, consecutively, of yes, yes, no, a bit, and—last year—yes again. (It was during the two years of "no" and "a bit"—1984 through 1986, when Congress first banned all aid, then only military aid—that Colonel North sought to circumvent Congress by funneling aid from other sources, including the Iran arms sale.) Lyndon Johnson once reminded critics that he was the only President we had. This is the only Congress we have. And by 1986 it did appear as if Congress had crossed a divide. After lengthy debate, both Houses voted military aid to the contras.

The Iran-contra affair shouldn't change all that, but it probably will. Less than three hours after Attorney General Meese had announced the discovery of the diversion of Iran arms funds to the contras, Senator David Durenburger of Minnesota, then chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, declared, "It's going to be a cold day in Washington, D.C., before any more money goes to Nicaragua."

This even before it was known whether or not the contra forces had seen any of the diverted money. This even before it was known whether the contras were even aware that funds were being illegally diverted for their benefit. What was known for more than a year was that the contras were the beneficiaries of some kind of supply operation run with a wink and a nod from the Administration. It was assumed that this was funded by "private" sources and possibly from money from third-party governments. And until Meese revealed that some money had also been skimmed from the Iran arms sales, this assumption aroused very little protest from Congress. Are the contras to be punished because they did not suspect an Iranian connection, something that, throughout November, no one in Congress (or in the press, for that matter) suspected?

But the gathering sentiment to reverse aid derives less from a desire to punish the contras than from a desire to punish the Administration. Of course, the Administration deserves to be punished. For the negligence of those who were ignorant or willed themselves into ignorance over the Iran arms affair. And for the lawlessness of those who actually carried out an operation designed to contravene congressional will.

But how to punish? Wounding a President by reversing his most cherished foreign policy goal is an understandable political instinct. But if it wounds the country, it is a bad one. Congress had come to the view that contra aid was in the national interest. It remains so. Abandoning that interest to get to a President is a high price to pay for sweet revenge.

The case for (and indeed, the case against the contras remains utterly unchanged by the North affair. Now as before, the case for the contras rests on two pillars. One strategic and the other ideological—moral, if you will.

For a century and a half the extraordinary security of the American mainland owed much to the fact that the U.S. resisted, under the Monroe Doctrine, any great-power penetration of its own hemisphere. For the past 40 years that local security has enabled the U.S. to look abroad and take responsibility for a vast alliance. Cuba was the first great breach in the Monroe Doctrine, and it has indeed complicated the U.S. strategic position not only in the Americas, where Cuba has actively engaged in the attempted destabilization of one country after another, but as far away as Africa, where Cuban troops serve as a Soviet foreign legion.

The Soviet bloc is now in the process of consolidating a second base in the Americas, this time on the mainland, in contiguity with Costa Rica and ultimately Panama to the south, and with Honduras, El Salvador and ultimately Mexico to the north. That the Sandinista revolution is without frontiers is not a hypothetical notion. It is historical. In the first years of their rule the Sandinistas poured considerable effort into the Salvadoran insurgency, which hoped to pull off a victory before the inauguration of Ronald Reagan. That attempt failed, but not for lack of trying. The Sandinistas have been more restrained in their support of the Salvadoran guerrillas during the Reagan Administration, not because of a change of heart but as a direct result of the military pressure that the U.S. has brought to bear during that time. Pressure in the form of the contras.

What is the strategic case against supporting a resistance that is trying to prevent the consolidation of a second Cuba? Some isolationists might argue that the "loss" of Third World countries does not really matter, and that we can sit behind a palisade of 10,000 nuclear warheads and not care who controls Central America. But the main opposition case is different. It does matter, say the Democrats. And the Sandinistas, they concede in speech after speech, are indeed Marxist-Leninist, expansionist, and pro-Soviet. But they can be contained by American power.

Tom Wicker, an articulate spokesman for the anti-contra view, put the case for containment: "Washington could state plainly that it will not tolerate any Soviet military base in Nicaragua, or any overt or covert attempt by Nicaragua to attack its neighbors." Now, what exactly does "will not tolerate" mean? One cannot just say it. Carter de-

clared the Soviet brigade in Cuba intolerable. Reagan declared the crackdown on Polish Solidarity intolerable. And the intolerable endured, despite the brave words. To be serious about containing Sandinista subversion—overt and covert—will mean vigilance, resources and risk. It will mean everything from pouring aid into El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica to establishing a ring of American bases around the border of Nicaragua; even, as Walter Mondale suggested during the 1984 campaign, to setting up a naval blockade to contain the Sandinistas. But why is it preferable so hugely to commit American resources? To station permanently American troops to serve as a trip wire? (That is how containment works in Europe: the principal function of American soldiers in forward positions is to die and thus bring the U.S. into any European war the Soviets might be tempted to start.) And if a blockade ever became necessary, the U.S. would risk confrontation not just with Nicaraguan forces but with Soviet forces as well. Why is that strategically preferable to supporting 15,000 Nicaraguans themselves prepared to fight to reclaim their country?

Because, say the critics, the contras cannot do the job. They cannot win. How these experts divine the outcome of civil wars is hard to fathom. The contras have more than twice the recruits the Sandinistas had when they overthrew Somoza. Which side is today more popular? It is hard to find out in a dictatorship. But it is worth nothing that the Sandinistas have a conscript army, while the contras are a volunteer force.

The contras do have severe problems. They are in the midst of another agonizing reorganization, as the liberal civilian leadership tries, with U.S. support, to gain control over the military (not an uncommon problem, incidentally, for American friends from the Philippines to Guatemala). Critics point to the lack of significant contra military gains until now as proof that they cannot win. Perhaps. But it is equally possible that the lack of success has to do with two years of a grossly unbalanced arms race between the contras and the Sandinistas. Such imbalances are not rectified overnight, nor do they lend themselves to military spectacles by the disarmed party. Guerrilla war requires arms, training and, above all, time for building an infrastructure in the countryside. The Sandinistas were in the field for 17 years before their victory over Somoza.

Some immediate visible success may be less a military than a political necessity for the contras. As Admiral William J. Crowe Jr., chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, if the contras do not have "some kind of success" soon, they will likely forfeit American support. The contras' greatest weakness could be the nature of their great-power patron. It could be that the U.S. does not have the patience to support the incremental struggle that is guerrilla war. And the contras certainly cannot win without outside support. Very few guerrilla armies do. Not even the Viet Cong did.

Which makes the "they can't win" refrain somewhat ironic. It comes most often from precisely those people in Congress who are constantly fighting to cut aid to the contras, reducing their supplies to the barest minimum, or trying to eliminate assistance altogether. Having disarmed the resistance, they then assert that it cannot win, and then cite the inability to win as a reason for disarming it. A neat circle.

But what of international morality? Even if it is strategically important for the U.S. to

prevent a Communist state in Central America, do not American values prevent us from overthrowing another government? In principle, no. It depends on the case. The 1983 overthrow of the thug government of Grenada, for example, surely qualified as one of the more moral exercises of American foreign policy.

The question of contra support, however, poses a different problem. It asks whether the U.S. has the right to support a 15,000-man peasant army that wants to overthrow its own government. That army believes that its country has been taken over by Leninists who have shut down the opposition, destroyed a free press, repressed the church and run a secret police "advised" by Cubans and East Germans. As the President of Costa Rica put it, the "Nicaraguan people . . . have fought so hard to get rid of one tyrant, one dictator, and seven years later they have nine."

Guerrilla war is always morally problematic, and it is therefore important for the U.S. to ensure that its allies conduct the war as humanely as any guerrilla war can be conducted. But is it wrong to support a resistance seeking to overthrow the rule of the comandantes? Americans value freedom in their own country. They would not tolerate the political conditions that Nicaraguans must suffer. There is no hope that Nicaraguans will enjoy anything near the liberty that Americans enjoy (and that the Nicaraguans were promised by the Sandinistas) unless their new tyranny is removed. How, then, does it serve American values to cut off aid to those trying to do the removing?

But then these arguments are familiar, too familiar. They have been debated in Congress and elsewhere with seasonal regularity. That is precisely the point, however. It is these familiar arguments that lie at the heart of the decision about whether the U.S. ought to support the contras. Not "What did the President know, and when did he know it?" The failings, even the illegalities, of a President alter neither American strategic interests nor the morality (or immorality) of supporting anti-Communist rebels. Let the debate begin, again. And may it be decided on its merits.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, as I address the Chair, the Committee on the Budget is today, as it has been in the past, dealing with the task of trying to bring out a fiscal 1988 budget. I want

to discuss some of the circumstances surrounding that.

It has become somewhat peculiar because the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget have refused to vote on the budget. In a rather extraordinary display, they have been sending letters to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget and the Democratic leadership setting forth their terms before they will participate in voting on the budget.

It seemed a little bizarre that trying to get Republican members of a committee to take part in its business would be a little bit more difficult than negotiating the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. It seems to me, when you are confronted with rather strange behavior, you ought to try and figure out why we have it.

What we have is the Republicans sending letters saying they are not going to participate in the budget, and one of the main objections is that the chairman has refused to come up with a Democratic document drawn up in isolation from them and making that the order of the day.

It seems particularly strange that the Republican Party members would object to being given the opportunity to participate equally, but the point is that no one is talking about derogating their rights whatsoever. If they have ideas on the budget, what they ought to do is sit in the Committee on the Budget, make motions, vote, act, the way people ordinarily act in a parliamentary situation.

They are refusing to do that. What they have said is, for instance, they cannot sit in on the Committee on the Budget until, among other things, they have conditions for their participation. One would have thought that having run for office and having been elected and having read the Constitution, they would have understood that it is their responsibility to sit in the Committee on the Budget and vote yes or no and make amendments. They say no, they will participate, as if their participating in doing their duty is some favor to us, unless various things happen.

One is that they want a guarantee, I guess, that there will be no continuing resolution. They do not like doing all things in one. Of course, the reason we had a continuing resolution last year of the size we did, and of previous years, was basically the failure of the Republican controlled other body to act. Last year, for instance, when we had to do a continuing resolution, the House passed virtually all of the appropriations bills. The other body passed only about half of them.

I say that in no spirit of censoriousness, in conformance to our rule. I simply mention the facts. The House passed nearly all the appropriations bills and the other body passed only half of them.

Now why is it the fact of the Democratic House that we had to do a continuing resolution when the Republican other body would not pass the appropriations bills? That is hardly a serious argument.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the Republican Party is refusing to participate in the budget process. They say that the Democrats must first bring out a version. Interestingly, Mr. Speaker, there was one thing the Republicans have not asked. They fear something enormously. You might have thought that with the President of the United States, of recent memory, having sent to the Congress his budget, that the Republican demand would have been let us use the Republican budget of the President of the United States as a starting point. That, Mr. Speaker, is the last thing they want.

Republican Members of this body have avoided Ronald Reagan's budget the way cobras seek to avoid more than one mongoose. The Republicans, during my tenure here, which coincides with Ronald Reagan's, not to our mutual desire, but as a matter of historical fact, have never—not only do they not vote for the Republican President's budget, when on two occasions, Members of the House have presented the President's budget for a vote on the floor, they have been denounced by the Republicans for dirty tricks.

□ 1530

The Republicans have considered it unfair. So we have a situation where the Republicans will not come to the budget conference, and they send treaty requests as if they were negotiating with a foreign country. Treaty requests just do not make sense. They were objecting because the Senate last year did not pass enough appropriation bills so we had to do a continuing resolution, insisting that there be a Democratic budget to start with, and specifically not asking that they start with the President's budget.

Why this budget avoidance on the part of the Republicans? Why do they sit in the Budget Committee and vote "present" and boycott it and announce that they are not coming? The answer is that they have put themselves in a box out of which they cannot escape, and the box consists of several wholly unrealistic assumptions. One is that you can reach the \$108 billion mandated by Gramm-Rudman rather easily.

They are saying that it is up to us to show them how to reach the 108. Well, there is a budget presented by the President of the United States in which he claims he has reached the \$108 billion as the deficit figure. The problem is, of course, that he is the only person in the United States of America who believes that. He probably believes it, because one of the dis-

tinguishing characteristics of President Reagan is an ability to believe what he wants to believe, the facts to the contrary.

Remember, the President is the man who told us that he still believes in his heart that he did not trade arms for hostages, even though he knows that he did. I have not yet been able to understand what that sentence meant, except that the President has an ability to engage in wishful thinking.

He says that he has reached the \$108 billion, and he says we are going to stick to the \$108 billion deficit target without raising taxes. Well, in the first place, the President does raise some revenues, as he calls them—taxes, other people might call them. For instance, in the President's budget, people on Medicare would pay more. Ronald Reagan has been very consistent here. In 1985, for instance, he worked very hard to try to reduce cigarette taxes from 16 cents a pack to 8 cents a pack, while making up for that lost revenue by increasing the amount people had to pay when they are on Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we would do better to tax the things that cause cancer rather than to tax the people who have cancer, and I think that the priorities the President showed in 1985 reverse that.

But the President has sent up a deficit figure that he says is down to \$108 billion, and no one believes it. If the Republican Members of this House believed it, they would be pushing it. Why have they not done that which they have a right to do, that is, gone into the Budget Committee's deliberations and say, "Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute the President's budget, item by item?" Why do they not just move to adopt the President's budget figures?

The reason is that they know it does not make any sense. It does not meet the deficit figure because it is inflated. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that it is about \$25 billion off from where they say it is on the budget, probably because of the revenue estimates—and those are matters in dispute—and probably because they say they have underestimated spending.

By the way, the reason we have an extraordinary problem right now has to do with what the President likes to refer to as an "economic miracle." The President was very proud of the economic growth we had in 1983 and 1984. And we did have great growth as we bounced back from the deepest recession in American history, although, according to the minority leader—pardon me, the Republican leader; they do not like to be called the minority—the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois, he does not apparently think the President de-

serves much credit for improving the economy, because in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 18, at page H1462, we have Mr. MICHEL saying: "What this Government has done to the American economy, good or bad, has in fact been done by the Congress, the legislative branch."

Now, that is a claim for congressional supremacy a little bit beyond what I would have suspected, but he says it is the Congress that has done it. I think it is shared myself. I do not think he gives the President enough credit. But I can understand he is trying to defend the President's decisions of late, and he may get a little exasperated. He has got to defend the President's veto of the highway bill, which he is not too crazy about defending. I can understand that. The problem is, whether you give Congress the credit or the President the credit for the economy, when Gramm-Rudman was passed and it set the deficit reduction targets, the President told us that we were going to have about 4 percent annual economic growth.

We have not come close to that. This economy has been performing, unfortunately, not very well in the last year. In some regions of the country there has been a serious failure, exacerbated by government policy. In the region that the Speaker represents, people have been damaged despite efforts by you and others, Mr. Speaker, to correct government policies. The overall impact has been, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that with last year's revenues, we begin fiscal year 1988 with about \$39 billion less in revenues than we expected to have when Gramm-Rudman was passed. Revenues are down by about \$39 billion because of the shortfall in the economy of which the President is so proud. The economy has behaved in a sputtering fashion, barely growing for a couple of quarters.

So, therefore, it is harder to reach the target, not because we have not made some expenditure reductions but because we did not get the revenues. It is hard to reach the target for that reason, so that is the dilemma.

The President says he does not want to raise taxes, except, of course, he does. He raises user fees. And, by the way, to give you an example of how supported the President is by the Republicans, one of the areas in which the President wanted to raise more revenue was this: He wanted to raise the fees that you pay if you buy a house through the Veterans' Administration or the FHA or if you use the Government National Mortgage Association, Ginnie Mae. Additional revenues for that were in the President's budget. He was going to put the Ginnie Mae increase into effect early in March. Both Houses, I think unanimously or close to unanimously, without recorded votes—a couple of Mem-

bers said they did not like it—repudiated it. Overwhelmingly, both Houses repudiated that.

So the first action we took on the President's budget was in a bipartisan way, to say, "no, don't raise the prices that middle income people who are trying to buy homes have to pay. Those are already too high."

At any rate, we have a budget where the President thinks he has reached a deficit target of \$108 billion, which is very hard to reach because there has been a revenue shortfall. And nobody else thinks he has reached it; nobody agrees with him. I do not think there are any Members of the House who are ready to state under oath, "yes, we believe the President has reached the target." And the proof of that—and let me emphasize this again—is that in all this dispute about the budget the Republican members of the Budget Committee have religiously, consistently, undeviatingly refused to talk about using the President's budget as a starting point. They have not offered it; they do not want to have anything to do with it. I understand that.

Instead, they say that there must be a Democratic budget to start with. What the chairman of the Budget Committee proposed was this: "Let's take as a markup document an outlay freeze." Now, there were a series of statements on the floor by some of the Republican Members a week ago saying that the chairman, by talking about using an outlay freeze as a starting point, was going to deny people a COLA.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the rules of the House require us to show due regard for the honorable intentions of Members of the House, and I always follow the rules of the House when there is a Parliamentary present. I do say that I do not recall a time when statements were made by a number of Members which in my judgment were more surprising. I am sure the Members who said that believed that because under the rules we obviously agree that everybody believes what they say here. But I am surprised that the Republican Members believed those incredible assertions that the chairman of the Budget Committee was in any way endangering the COLA.

What he was saying was this: "Let's start with the outlay freeze and amend it from there," and the Republican Members declined to vote. They would not vote on any of this. Instead, they sent us letters. They sent a letter to the Speaker saying, "We must have a budget proposal submitted by the committee majority as a basis for discussion."

Why? Will a Republican Member tell me why they did not offer the President's budget? I know why I would not have offered it. I do not think it is any good. But if that is

what they agree with, then I think we ought to know that.

They asked if there were reconciliation instructions. There always have been. And they say that any omnibus appropriation bill will be discouraged at all times. The opinion of the Republicans on omnibus bills varies. We did not have an omnibus appropriation bill in 1981. We had one, and I have it here. Maybe some of the Members will be nostalgic about this. I know that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, sitting over there probably has not seen it for a while. This is Gramm-Latta, Mr. Speaker, in which the Republicans put together one single piece of legislation which nobody on their side had read and nobody on our side had seen. They at least knew how thick it was, but we did not. It did terrible damage to poor people, elderly people, working people. Students lost loans, elderly people lost their minimum Social Security income. The Republicans voted for it in lockstep because they were told they had to. They had no problem voting for that.

Here is where we are in the budget process: We have a very difficult situation because the economy has failed to grow at anything like Ronald Reagan told us it would grow. We do not have the revenues that would allow us to meet the Gramm-Rudman target very easily. The President's response to that was to pretend that he met the targets when no one else thinks he has, and the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan institution headed currently by a Republican says, "No, Mr. President, you are about \$30 billion off." And the Republicans in the House go the President one better. He sends in a budget which he pretends meets the \$108 billion target, and they do not do anything at all. They will not vote on it, and they avoid it because they know how impossible the task is that they set for themselves.

□ 1540

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's discussion. The gentleman mentioned the Gramm-Latta proposal. Was that not the one that had a secretary's phone number printed in it inadvertently? I presume that was inadvertent.

Mr. FRANK. I would say to the gentleman I do not think it is Fawn Hall's number, if that is what the gentleman was going to ask me next. I do not know who the secretary is in question. I believe that phone number, as you know, is now the law of the land be-

cause it was voted on obediently by the Members on the other side.

Of course, I will have to say this to my friend from Michigan: They learned, having voted for Gramm-Latta, which they regretted and which they lost seats over in 1982. They are not voting for any more Presidents' budgets.

You know, in the 7 years I have been here the President's budget has come up twice on the floor. No Republican has ever offered Ronald Reagan's budget beginning in 1982. Mr. GRAY offered the fiscal 1987 budget last year. The vote was 312 to 12 against it. Seventy-eight Republicans voted "present."

In 1984, our late colleague, not late as a human being, just late as our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado who has now gone to the Senate, he offered the President's budget and it lost 401 to 1. I do not know who the one Republican was who stood by his man in 1984 because that was an election year so they were a little nervous about that.

The Republicans have abandoned the President's budget; they no longer want to have anything to do with it. By the way, it is not because it does not have enough spending. One of the arguments that we have got is that the President portrays himself as the person who is preventing Congress from spending more. The fact is that since Ronald Reagan became President, Congress has appropriated virtually the exact amount that Ronald Reagan has asked for; virtually the exact amount.

In most years, we appropriate marginally less; in a couple of years more. There is 1 year out of the 7 when there was a significant, a statistically significant difference. For fiscal 1983, at a time when we were in a deep recession, Congress voted \$12 billion more than the President asked at a time when the budget was about \$500 billion. So \$12 billion out of \$500 billion, about a 2-percent-plus increase, that is because we thought we should respond to the misery of the recession and the President thought you would respond to that in a different way.

Other than that, more often than not, Congress has underappropriated and the totals for the 7 years of Ronald Reagan sending in budgets, including up to this year, with supplementals and everything else, are virtually identical. There is no question the President honestly believes that he has sent in lower budgets and Congress has voted more than he has requested.

Focusing on detail, we are told, is not one of Ronald Reagan's great strengths. That is an enormous understatement. Focusing on the facts is not one of Ronald Reagan's moderate strengths. He does not, I think, understand; I do not think he consciously

misleads. But the fact is indisputable, the amount appropriated by the Congress, half of which, of course, was Republican during his first 6 years, but the amount appropriated has been essentially what he has asked for. The totals are minimal. According to the table I have here from the Appropriations Committee, the President's budget requests came to \$3,572,289,000,000, and we appropriated \$3,557,000,000,000. So we are talking about a \$15 billion difference where Congress voted less. The only year where Congress voted significantly more, statistically more, was fiscal 1983. That was a vote taken in early in 1982 in the middle of tough recession.

So Congress has voted less than the President asked for. Why are we in such a difficult situation? Probably because of the unprecedented defense buildup. But we are in a particular problem right now with regard to Gramm-Rudman deficit targets because Ronald Reagan said the economy would grow by about 4 percent per year and he has simply been wrong, and that is a sad fact. I wish it were not the case; I wish we had economic growth so that there were not unemployed people in the big cities and we did not have the misery we have on the farms; we did not have people who are hurting the way they are. But we have it. To pretend that we have that revenue when we do not is a mistake. We have a \$39 billion gap in revenue. By the way, the President then says, "Well, we are never going to raise taxes." He is going to raise taxes; he calls them a little bit different. The President in his budget, to reach his 108, does include increases in money that people pay the Government to the tune of about \$7.5 billion in new fees or increased fees; 2.4 he says in increased tax enforcement. He is looking for the people to pay the Government \$10 billion more than they otherwise would have. He does not want to call them taxes. I understand that. When he released a Russian spy in return for Nick Daniloff, he did not want to call that a swap.

When he sent arms to the Iranians in the hope that they would let some hostages come forward, he did not want to call that a trade. Ronald Reagan does not like to call things by their names; he is a man of great semantic delicacy. If, in his hour of travail, that gives him comfort, who are we to deny him that comfort.

The fact is that he is asking the public to cough up another \$10 billion. Now, some of us have suggested maybe we could cough up even a little bit more, maybe up to 18 to 20. The Republicans have said in one level, no, but there was an interesting thing in their treaty proposal. Actually, I think we, I was surprised that it was the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LATTA, who was approaching Mr. GRAMM. I would have

thought they would have sent us Max Kampelman or General Rowney. These people have not been able to get any agreements with the Russians and so there would have been no danger of getting any agreement with the chairman of the Budget Committee. See, I do not think they wanted an agreement. Remember again where we are. We have a budget deficit target of \$108 billion in Gramm-Rudman overwhelmingly supported by the Republican side. It came out of the Republican Senate.

It was always a difficult target to hit; it has been made virtually impossible to hit it by the Reagan shortfall in economic growth. So the President sends us a budget which he says meets the target and nobody believes him. CBO says is off by a factor of about 25 percent or more. The Republicans show their respect for their President by refusing to offer the President's budget. It is the absent actor in this scene.

You know, there is a Sherlock Holmes novel, I always like to be accurate on the floor. In this piece of fiction at one point Watson says, "Holmes, how did you know that such and such happened?" Holmes says, "It was the dog, Watson." And Watson, in his usual idolatrist incredulity says, "But Holmes, the dog did not do anything." And Holmes, in his kind of superiority said, "Ah-ha, the fact that the dog did not bark was significant." That is how he solved the crime.

Well, we apparently have some self-styled fiscal watchdogs on the Republican side, and here came the President's budget and guess what? Nobody barked. We got the President's budget and he says, "I have got the solution to the \$108 billion." It has not been offered in the Budget Committee; maybe it is going to be offered on the floor, but if history is our guide, it will not be because the Republicans have never offered the President's budget on the floor since I have been here, and only 12 of them voted for it the last time. They thought it was a dirty trick. So that is where we are with regard to their own view of how they do things.

The question now is how do we deal with this particular budgetary problem. The question some of us have raised is well maybe we should have more revenues. The President asked for the public to pay \$10 billion more, he also says he is going to get an additional \$10 billion and I think one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida is going to address this by asset sales. Asset sales in which you exaggerate the amount of money you are going to get. You damage the future income stream of the Government, you do a lot of short-term gimmickry. These asset sales make very,

very poor fiscal sense and the President is talking about them.

Then we have, the Republicans have, well, they have sent two letters. They sent a March 18 letter to Mr. GRAY and then apparently they renegotiated among themselves and they have a new condition here, and this is interestingly worded,

No provision in the Budget Resolution provides for any adjustment in individual or corporate income tax rates.

Well, you know, there are a lot of other taxes that are at the individual and corporate income tax rates. We are not hearing too many proposals for raising the corporate tax rates right now. There was a proposal made to raise the income tax rates at the highest level, but there are other things that can be done. We could raise cigarette taxes. I think a lot of people would like to see cigarette taxes raised. Apparently, the Republicans say that is absolutely out of the question.

We can close loopholes. When the Republican Party says, "Absolutely no tax increases, except the \$10 billion the President asked for," and you see what happens is when the President asks for them they are no longer tax increases. When the President says, "Make old people on Medicare pay more for their Medicare," that is OK; that is not a tax increase.

□ 1550

He talks about repealing some of the gasoline tax exemptions that some people have. He wants to make State and local employees pay more for Medicare, even though they may never get Medicare. He has got an increased tax on tips, on coal production. He has other small tax increases here and there. He would particularly increase the amount you have to pay if you want to get Government help buying a home at a time when home ownership is too high; so \$10 billion of what the President wants to do comes from more money from the public, from us; \$10 billion of it comes from asset sales, which are kind of phony.

By the way, those account for the \$108 billion, that is the way he gets to the \$108 billion. Even with those, he is still way off.

But I guess the question I would ask the Republicans when they say no tax increases at all, I guess dynasty is a relevant literary analogy here. Maybe the tax debate of last year was a dream and we are all going to wake up and emerge from it.

We passed a tax bill last year, which I voted for in the end. It had large bipartisan support, but even its most enthusiastic supporters have never argued that it got rid of all loopholes.

What the people who tell us no taxes at all are saying is that we have a perfect Tax Code. You do not have to increase equity. That is nonsense.

There continued to be, everybody knows that, there are all kinds of deals and trades. That is the nature of this process. There are all kinds of places in that Tax Code where without raising tax rates on the average person or on the average business you could easily raise \$15 billion to \$20 billion. Only those who believe we have a perfect Tax Code, people who think raising cigarette taxes is going to be a terrible idea, I think most Americans think the other way around.

There was a little special deal that was put in, voted by Democrats, the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana on the Senate side, where if you give money to a employee stock option plan, you do not have to pay any taxes. That was done in a rather poor fashion and it could cost us billions of dollars. We could knock that one out. We could close that one out. That is not going to hurt the economy.

There are tax loopholes that can be closed. All these things will be difficult to do. We have a deficit to which all parties have contributed, the President, the Senate, the House. We have overspent in some areas where I like spending. We have underspent in some areas where I do not like spending. We need a serious effort to collaborate. We are not getting it.

One reason we are not getting it may have been indicated by Pat Buchanan. Pat Buchanan was one of the President's chief strategists. He is the man who said that the greatest political vacuum in America was to the right of Ronald Reagan and that he was going to fill it for awhile, until I think he realized how happy the Democrats were at the prospect; but what he says is, he just wrote this in Newsweek, that the President should not compromise with us because a fight is the best way to keep Iran and Nicaragua off the front pages.

We have a situation where the President is somewhat embarrassed and his top people are embarrassed by the revelations of the Tower Commission, the revelations yet to come of the two special investigating committees, of the special counsel, now called the independent counsel, which by the way the Justice Department will not tell us if it thinks it is constitutional. We have something that has been on the books since 1978. The President signed a revision of it in 1982. The President signed it and we have asked the Justice Department if it is constitutional and they are a little bit offended to be asked. These people who have prescribed fairly specific personal regulations for most Americans appear to consider it an invasion of their privacy for the Congress of the United States to ask them if they think this statute that they signed into law in a revised form in 1982 is constitutional. They will not tell us.

Why will they not tell us? We know why. It is because they think it is unconstitutional, but they are embarrassed to say it is unconstitutional while so many of the President's closest friends are under investigation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to my good friend, a member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield, not for the purpose of extending his excellent presentation, because I hope to follow him shortly thereafter, but the gentleman will recall that in the Judiciary Committee the Attorney General of the United States appeared before the full committee and responded to that question from not only myself, but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and if I remember correctly, I thought he assured us that he felt fairly comfortable with the constitutionality of that provision, but I remember that immediately after, that same afternoon he held a press conference in which he announced something that appeared somewhat to the contrary.

I say that to jog the memory of the gentleman from Massachusetts about this subject.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right. He called my attention to that. The Attorney General appeared before us, discussed the subject, and then a couple hours later without having mentioned it to us, appointed the independent counsel, Mr. Walsh, as an Assistant Attorney General; but he did not say he was comfortable with the constitutionality. As I remember, what he said when I asked him, he said, "We are trying to find a way to defend this law."

I suggested going into court and filing a brief might be a fairly routine way, but they have not been willing to do that. They just will not take a position, and still when they testified before the Senate committee they refused to say whether they thought the law was constitutional or not, they were still working on it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and again I am not trying to prolong his discussion unduly, but the Attorney General was under oath at the time that he gave that statement, so I want to assure all my colleagues that even though he omitted to indicate that he had already obviously had other intentions and plans which were not revealed under fairly repeated questioning on this subject, that I do not believe that he violated the oath that he gave Chairman RODINO when he began his testimony.

Mr. FRANK. Well, I would agree, and I would also point out to my

friend that while the chairman swore Mr. Meese in, he neglected to give him a Miranda warning, so even if there had been any problem I think the Attorney General would probably be in the clear, because we still believe in those principles.

Mr. Speaker, I was just talking about what I think the motivations are. Pat Buchanan has been the ideological defender of the Reagan administration and when he has taken time away from objecting to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals, he has given the President some political advice, according to Newsweek. What he says, this is Pat Buchanan in the current issue of Newsweek, page 24:

Iran-Contra, however, is the least hospitable terrain on which to engage. It is imperative to move it off. To get this controversy off page 1 we must find a new controversy to put on to page 1.

So what we have, I think, and some people think even the budget would be a good one to fight over. I mention that, but let no one think we have forgotten the devastating implications of the conduct of the irrational foreign policy of the Iran-Nicaragua situation; but I think that helps illustrate the phoniness of the budget crisis.

Here is where we are, very simply. Gramm-Rudman was passed late in 1985 on the assumption that we would have about a 4-percent economic growth. While Gramm-Rudman is passing, the economy is faltering significantly from that level. As a result, if you just look at the projection of revenues for fiscal year 1987—I may have misstated this before, so let me state it exactly now—in 1985 a projection was made by Government agencies about what the revenues would be based on the economy. Now we have a current projection; of course, that fiscal year is about half over. We are about \$39 billion short, so the problem of meeting the Gramm-Rudman target, why is it so difficult? Because the \$108 billion deficit for this year was based on an assumption of a degree of economic growth that would have given us \$39 billion more in revenue. We are at least conservatively \$39 billion more in the hole.

Now, how do we deal with a problem of a target which is now unrealistic, because the economic assumptions on which it was based have not been reached?

President Reagan's proposal is in the first place to ask for \$10 billion in new taxes and fees from the American public, while denying that he is asking for them, so you get more from old people on Medicare and you get more from people trying to buy homes and then you claim that you are going to get an additional \$11 billion by selling off the assets of the Government, short-term cash increase, does not do anything for your balance sheet. Selling assets does not increase the Gov-

ernment's wealth. In fact, it will diminish in some cases future income because of selling off assets that could have paid something back, so you get \$10 billion in new taxes and fees, while you deny that. You get another \$11 billion asset sales which are very shaky and very poor business practice. They are the kind of things that business people shudder at, give Government a bad name, and even with those, and, oh, then you underestimate spending. You basically underestimate the number of old people who are going to get sick and you put that down.

□ 1600

You know you have to pay it later, but you underestimate it, and with all that you come up with a figure that the Congressional Budget Office says, no, Mr. President, under your proposal it would be about \$135 billion, not \$108 billion. So the President reaches the task that has been made impossible by the economic shortfall by a set of phoney numbers that he believes in. I do not impugn his sincerity. I impugn his capacity. I do not think he understands the extent to which he has numbers that do not make sense, and he thinks they make sense.

Now then, what happens? The Democrats say over here, well, all right, there are a couple of things that we can do. We could raise taxes a little more than he raises them. He is talking about \$10 billion and we are talking about another \$10 or \$15 billion, and there are various ways. I would like to raise cigarette taxes. Some of my colleagues would not want to do that. We could close some loopholes that were left open last year, or we could close a couple that were reopened last year in last year's bill. In that bill we reduced loopholes and we took fundamental steps in the direction of equity, but we did not do it perfectly.

The Republicans are now going to pretend that we have this perfect bill and that there is no way to increase revenues a little bit. No, they do not want to do that. The Democrats have said let us talk about how we can deal with this in a realistic way. Let us start, and the chairman, Chairman GRAY said, start with an outlay freeze and let us add or subtract from that outlay freeze based on that. The Republicans said, "No, we are not going to play. You do it, and then we will come in and talk about it."

Well, where is it written in the Constitution and in the rules of the House that the Republican members of the committee cannot participate unless the Democrats draft a version for them to start with? And whatever happened to the President's budget? Why does not the Republican Party in the House—is there not one Republican who is prepared to say this is my

President's budget and I support it, and I offer it to the Budget Committee? No one has said that he is prepared to do that.

What we have is a Republican decision to say that the \$108 billion target is inviolate, that there is no need for any additional revenues because apparently we have a perfect Tax Code with no loopholes. No one is talking about raising taxes on the average citizen. We are talking about closing some loopholes, some of us. They do not want to hear about that, so they cook up a very transparent set of demands. That is really what they sent most recently. JIM WRIGHT, the Speaker of the House, got from the Republican leader, the Republican whip, not the majority leader or the majority whip, the Republican leader and the Republican whip—the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Mississippi—they sent the Speaker a letter. Frankly, it looks like something Dean would have gotten from SDS in 1968: These are our demands, and this is what they are telling people they will do. They will come to the Budget Committee and make motions and vote on things.

It is not a favor that the Republicans do the Democrats to participate. What we have is a facade erected by the Republican Party because they do not want to deal with the budget process. They do not believe the President has reached the \$108 billion. They do not agree with him anyway, by the way, and in the speeches made on the floor of the House a week ago about the budget by my Republican colleagues, they all managed when they mention the President's budget to say, "But, of course, I do not agree with it; I do not agree with the priorities." Well, if you do not agree with the budget priorities, then I do not know what is left. So they really do not believe in the President's budget, but they have hoked up this reason not to participate.

In the past, of course, the Republicans have complained because the Democrats did come up with a budget, and they have said, "Oh, you did something privately, on your own." Now you come in and expect us to deal with it; that is not fair. So this year the chairman, Chairman GRAY, said we have a very difficult prospect here because the economy under Ronald Reagan has performed so much less well than we thought, and we do not have the kinds of revenues we thought we would have, and we may not be able to reach the Gramm-Rudman target. What do you want to do about it? Do you want to do the President's budget; do you want to start with outlay freezes? Have you got some other suggestion? The Republican members of the Budget Committee are firmly for none of the above. They

simply do not want to deal with the situation.

We will be talking further about the budget. As I said, the gentleman from Florida, I think, is going to address the shakiness of the economic principles and practices reflected by the asset sales. We will also be talking about what specific damage would be done by the President's budget to reach the \$108 billion, which he does not reach, and even while falling about \$25 billion to \$30 billion short of the Gramm-Rudman target, the President does enormous damage to students, to older people, to people who are quite needy.

We talk on the one hand about competitiveness, and we get a budget that says let us not have any Federal help for vocational education, which would undercut our ability to be competitive. That was in the budget that the President sent, secure in the knowledge that no one would ever act on it. If the President thought that that was going to be enacted into law, he would fear the consequences, but he knew that no Members of the Republican Party in this House would advocate the President's budget, as for 7 years they have consistently refrained from doing. Well, for 6 years. They worked for the Gramm-Latta in 1981 and virtually every Republican in this body, or everyone in one form or another, with a couple of exceptions, voted for Gramm-Latta.

Then too many of them spent too much time—they lost—and they spent too much time explaining to people why they voted to cut survivors' benefits for veterans, and Social Security, and why they had cut so deep into these other programs, and why they had knocked female members of religious orders, nuns, or supplemental income security.

So, they have said in one way or another that they are not ready, and have decided not to vote for the President's budget again. So they do not offer the President's budget. They have occasionally offered a budget of their own, not always, and this year we are confronted with the difficulty of meeting the Gramm-Rudman targets, and the Republican response has been inaction. I have never, having been in American parliamentary bodies since 1973, the State legislature and here, and I have read a lot about it, but frankly, I had thought that I was in Japan or in South Korea when I read a letter from the Republicans on the Budget Committee saying, "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, we will not participate unless you meet the following conditions." When did these become negotiable demands as a part of our parliamentary practice? They are a facade behind which the Republicans hide because they neither want to support the President's budget nor put forward one of their own.

On the Democratic side, the caucus had a recommendation which was: Let us take an outlay freeze and go up or down from that. That was the proposal put forward. The Republicans would not vote on that at all, because they do not want to make difficult political decisions. They want to pretend that you can reach the \$108 billion; they want to pretend that \$10 billion apparently of taxes and increases and fee increases on the people that the President asked for are not for that, and they will not talk about other types of increases, even if we are talking about some inequity and agree to close some loopholes and make it freer.

What is it they want to do? They want assurances that they will not have a continuing resolution.

Well, last year we had one because the Republican Senate voted not to pass on many of the appropriation bills. This House did not pass them all, but the House passed 11 out of 13. The Senate passed only 7 of the 13, and passed some of them so late that it was obvious that they never intended that they would pass them. The failure of the Republican Senate last year to pass appropriation bills has become one of the reasons invoked by our Republican colleagues here for not participating in the budget process.

The budget process will be a difficult one this year. Meeting the Gramm-Rudman target, even with the revenues that we had anticipated, would have been very difficult. With the economy under President Reagan having performed so much worse than he thought it would, and causing us to have so much less in tax revenue, it is virtually impossible to meet the \$108 billion without an enormous amount of pain, some tax increases, or something else.

The President has waved his magic wand and pretended that he has \$108 billion. Not one Republican supports the President's budget, not one.

I am told by my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], that when he was asking the Secretary of Defense what he felt the response ought to be to this budget dilemma, the Secretary of Defense said, "Pass the President's budget." And both Democrats and Republicans in the committee laughed, involuntarily, because the President's budget is not a serious document.

The Democrats will be coming forward with something. We have a prediction that we will never see a Republican budget. They have not produced one yet, and they do not like the President's budget. The reason is that for them, trying to produce a budget would be to admit that it is impossible in an intellectually defensible way to take the position they are taking, that you can reach the \$108 billion with no tax increases, and the President has

tax increases in here, and he still does not meet the \$108 billion.

The CBO says he is off. They would have to admit that what they are saying makes no sense, so they take refuge in the nonresponsibility of being in the minority, and they will make statements that it will be impossible to verify, but they will feel secure. And I think that we can predict again for the seventh year in a row that the Republican Members of this body will not support the President's budget.

I hope it will be offered. I will ask the Rules Committee, if no one else will; I will offer the President's budget. It seems to me, with all of the work that went into that, somebody ought to get a shot at it, and we will vote on it, and the Republicans will be unhappy about that, and they will, we assume, produce nothing. Maybe they are unhappy with the President's budget because it has too much tax increase in it. It does have \$10 billion of increased contributions by the public to the Government, although it is interesting that we have already voted, and I see my leader in housing, the gentleman from Texas, is here.

□ 1610

One of the things he knows that the President proposes is, "Let's get more money from people who want to buy houses." I mean, you can't have Americans running around promiscuously buying houses when we have to build star wars. Where is there sense of what is important in this world?

So let's make them pay some more when they get a mortgage. And part of that was additional revenue that was going to come from raising the fees that you had to pay for using the Government National Mortgage Association.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] expeditiously brought a bill to this floor to prevent that from taking effect which was revenue the President was counting in his budget—it was virtually unanimously accepted. I believe one Republican was going to object to it and a couple of other Republicans went up to him and said, "Let us explain to you what's in here" and they dropped it.

So that's the situation we are in. The President has got a fake budget. He has got air there. He has got a figure of \$108 billion that includes some tax increases, includes some shaky asset sales and still does not make it, and the response of the Republican Party in the House? "Self-preservation has sensibly come out ahead of party loyalty." The President is a good fellow, but they are still not going to be caught with his budget. They are not going to defend it; they are not going to vote for it; they are

not going to offer it in the Budget Committee.

They are going to sit there and pretend to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and I rise—I do not want to detract from the gentleman's time—but I rise to adhere to his utterances, his observations, which are always incisive, and quite to point.

The gentleman is one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and he is one of the leaders in the Housing Subcommittee, which I happen to chair.

I just wanted to thank him for his reference to the recently enacted legislation that would have prevented the mandated increase and the fees that GNMA, the secondary mortgage institution, was ordered to exact, that would have raised the cost of home purchases depending on the region you lived in in the country anywhere from \$600 to \$1,200.

I wanted to advise the gentleman that as of today, I have a copy of a letter from the Home Loan Bank Board mandating that its secondary mortgage institution, Freddie Mac, not go beyond a ceiling and a cap that has been mandated by the Office of Management and Budget.

What that means is that with the average American family being priced out of the dream of ownership of a suitable home; new or newly constructed, that this is one more impediment that we are going to have to get up and ask to join with my distinguished colleague to ward off and fight off again.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and we should point out that these are the ways in which President Reagan tries to make the \$108 billion budget deficit. He says he is against tax increases, but he is ordering these agencies to raise the amount of money that people spend to buy houses.

Now, some people say, well, a tax is involuntary; and this is not involuntary. That is right, this is voluntary; you do not have to buy a house. I suppose you could live in your car. You could live in the house you live in. You could have your job move and commute 400 miles.

The President says, "Let's make"—predominantly middle-income people we are talking about here—"pay more when they go to buy a house." Well, for some people, what is \$600, \$1,200? It is a lot of money, as the gentleman knows.

The President mandated that it be increased, and as he says now, they have got new limits on Freddie Mac—it is going to make it harder for people

to buy a house. I suppose the view of the administration is that it is after all so important to send money to Nicaragua, to the Contras, and that money is so well used, as the gentleman knows, that a few Americans should not mind giving up their chance to buy a house. Maybe they should, you know, if they get knocked out by a ceiling and "We can't afford the house" they will feel good knowing that the Contras have gotten that money and the world is being made safe for democracy, as they live in whatever inadequate conditions they are living in.

Mr. Speaker, I again yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Again, I am compelled to rise because the gentleman again has made reference to the perversity of priorities that the leadership of this administration, beginning with the President seems to have set.

Tragically, we have—the net consequences or the continuing, growing roles of homeless Americans, a blot to America if ever there was one. The other consequence: For the first time since 1914, within the last 2 years our Nation is a debtor nation. We are the biggest debtor nation.

These are the fruits of a President that ends up in being the first known nothing President we seem to have on our hands.

Mr. FRANK. Well, let me ask my friend from Texas, he is an expert in the housing area: We hear a lot of unhappiness about homelessness. The homeless did not come from Mars; they are Americans who have been in some cases priced out of their markets.

I think the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. GONZALEZ] housing expertise is well regarded; and virtually unanimously the House, both sides, agreed with him—and let us be clear about this. Ronald Reagan says, "One way to reduce the budget deficit is to charge people more money when they buy homes and use the secondary mortgage market institution known as Ginnie Mae. And let's raise the amount that they have to pay. That is one way to reduce the deficit." That was counted, that revenue, I believe, in the President's budget.

The gentleman from Texas approached Members on the other side with whom he has a good working relationship, the gentleman from Connecticut, the gentleman from Ohio, ranking members of the subcommittee and full committee; and he said, "Do you agree with this?" They said no.

So, in a very quick movement, the House said "No, we're not going to do that." I think we ought to understand this. While people pretend to pay such tribute to the President, no one stood on the floor of the House to defend the first shot in the Reagan budget war.

We said, "Wait a minute. You can't do that"—he was going to do it right away. We repudiated that. I would ask my friend, what would the impact on homelessness be if we would adopt this Reagan budget, as he has sent it to us?

I would ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] if he could tell us what he thought the effect on our efforts to deal with homelessness would be if we adopted a budget that President Reagan had sent us, which to their credit, not one Republican Member of the House is for adopting. But suppose it somehow got adopted?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the immediate effect would have been to add to the rolls not less than half a million homeless Americans.

The long-term effect would have been of course compounded, and it would be difficult to try to figure out a number.

I think the thing, though, that is correlated to this question you raise is, "What have been the consequences of the lack of leadership in this important area of budget formulation, of realistic recommendations to the Congress for budgetary deficit reductions?"

What has been the price this country has paid? Well, they say—there is an old saying that says: The triumphs of a demagogue are fleeting, but the ruins are eternal.

What we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is a complete disorderly array in both our budgetary processes, in our fiscal and monetary management, merely because of the absence of executive department leadership. There is simply no leadership over there.

In every single thing that has finally been done it has been as a form of give-and-take or a tradeout with the congressional Members that can pass something that would be palatable to the President, that he could sign, and that he could describe as a not new tax bill.

For example, the 1983-84 tax bill, he did not call it that; he called it a revenue enhancement, a user's fee; but it was a tax bill, and he could sign it.

The end result is hard to see. All I can tell you is that if we continue the way we are, we will see the greatest number of homeless Americans than even during the Depression, given the differences in population from that time that I hope does not happen, but nothing is being done to divert us from that course.

The President's disastrous course is exemplified by fighting us. He spent \$200,000 2 years ago in an attempt to disprove the figures that we had arrived at after many comprehensive hearings as to the total number of homeless in America. This year, he presents a budget in which he admits there is a problem of homelessness,

and is recommending \$100 million in the budget.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the point.

The question of taxes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to give some more specifics to a point I made before, as I summarize here, but I am told by my Republican friends: "No, we can't increase taxes."

Well, last year in the tax bill, and I think generally the tax bill improved equity, but it created one new loophole: Allowing estates to deduct from estate taxes the proceeds of sales of stock to employee stock option plans, stock ownership plans, even if the estate was not directly involved with it.

It was drafted improperly. That will occasionally happen. It was on the whole a well-drafted bill, but occasionally an error will slip in.

The Treasury and CBO now assume that that bill will cost us in foregone revenue, \$7 billion over a 5 year period, which was not intended. I presume the no-new-tax people are going to want to say "OK, that's \$7 billion we don't get back." I think that is \$7 billion we ought to try and pick up. I do not find that a very useful way to deal with things.

So that shows the hollowness of this argument: "Never raise any taxes at all." No, I do not want to raise taxes on middle Americans, on upper-income Americans, on low-income Americans of most stripes; I do want to close some more of the loopholes.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, here we are: The deficit target was \$108 billion set in December 1985 with Gramm-Rudman. Because of the shortfall in the economy, its failure to perform the way President Reagan and his economic advisers have consistently said—they have for years now, a couple years, consistently overpredicted the economy; and it has preformed less well.

□ 1620

We have about \$39 billion less to work with than we thought, which makes the \$108 billion very hard to reach. The President pretends that he has reached it or he probably thinks he has; he does that by making damaging cuts on elderly, sick people, on our policies in the area of the homeless, on education, on students, damaging cuts there. Even with that and with asking for \$10 billion more in fees from the elderly on Medicare and people trying to buy homes and with asset sales which are poorly planned with phoney figures of \$11 billion, even with that he comes up with a budget which CBO says, "You are still \$27 billion off." The Democratic response is to say, "OK, let us start with a freeze on the budget in outlays and go up and down from there and see how close we can come, and maybe we

can close some tax loopholes. Maybe there is a way to do taxes equitably, let us take a look at it." The President, after all, has asked for \$10 billion in taxes and fees, so maybe we can go to \$15 billion or \$16 billion. So let us take a look at the subject. Our Republican colleagues say no to all of it, no to the President's budget, which they won't because it is debt-advocating, no, they will not offer the President's budget at the Budget Committee.

You would have thought, if you just came in here naively on a tour, that Republican Members of the House of Representatives, sitting in the Budget Committee, might offer in whole or piece by piece a budget submitted by the Republican President. They know better, they know what a shambles that budget is, how much damage it would do to innocent people, how intellectually flawed its assumptions are. So they ignore that and instead, like SDS reborn, they send a list of demands to the Budget Committee chairman saying we will not participate in the process until you guarantee us that the Senate is going to pass all the appropriation bills. That is one of the things they are asking for. Of course, the Senate did not do that when it was in Republican hands, it passed about half of them. It says you have to insist that there will be no tax increases at all. Probably no loopholes could be closed. I do not know what that means about the tax increases that the President wants, whether they, like the President, think that because he has asked for them they are not tax increases. But that is where we are.

Yes, we will on our side come up with a budget. It will cause some pain to people because we have, all of us, overspent. The President has asked for a little bit more money than Congress has appropriated, but we have appropriated virtually the same amount. So the blame for spending is a shared blame; in my view much too much went to the military. I do not know how many hundreds of millions have gone down a rathole in Nicaragua and Central America that could have been used, had we had them, to reduce the homelessness completely—well, not completely, but substantially, not completely. In any case, that is where we stand today.

A budget by the President that no one respects and no one believes in, that is a laugh.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say that for the last hour the House has been treated to an extemporaneous address the equal of which I have not heard in a long time, and I genuinely want to commend my colleague from Massachusetts for his very intimate and expert knowledge of

budgetary matters. I am delighted to hope that he continues his service in this excellent regard. I share with him a lot of the work in Judiciary, but I think that his remarks this evening should be studied very carefully in their printed version by each and every Member of the House and Senate.

Mr. FRANK. I appreciate that very much. As my time expires, I should say that my expertise owes a lot to the work of Mr. Cahn and Mr. Klueter of my staff who helped make me an expert. But I can assure the gentleman that many of us intend to continue discussing this situation in which we have a shabby budget from the President, intellectually shabby, and I think in policy terms, a Republican Party that will neither espouse their own President's budget nor come up with any alternatives and who act as if they would be doing the rest of us an enormous favor if they just sat on the committee and did their duty and voted on issues.

I yield back any time I have remaining.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE OCCASION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25, 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize the glorious history which those of the Greek heritage and Greek Orthodox faith celebrate every March 25. It is also an honor for me to have some of my colleagues participate in this celebration and to them I express my appreciation and fellowship in sharing the significance of this glorious date.

March 25 is worthy of celebration for many reasons by those of us with a Hellenic heritage. It is Greek Independence Day, the 166th anniversary of Greece's independence from the yoke of the Ottoman Empire. The long and arduous struggle of the Greeks against their Turkish oppressors is no less than a perfect example of the ability to overcome obstacles that appear insurmountable if the will to persevere is strong enough. The example of the Greeks is one that op-

pressed people throughout the world should look to and gain strength from in their struggle to overcome their oppressors. Indeed, the example of the Greeks overcoming the Ottoman invader is the ultimate example of justice and right prevailing over might.

Mr. Speaker, I would interrupt my presentation here by yielding to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Tarpon Springs, the citadel of Greek cities here in the United States, for recognizing me on this grand occasion when we have the opportunity to honor the 166th birthday of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire. I think Americans should also be conscious of the unique contribution made by our own experiment in liberty to the Greek experience because when the Greeks established independence in the 1820's, intellectuals from that country translated our Constitution and Declaration of Independence and they used our Declaration as their own. And we borrowed heavily from the Greek experience in our experiment in liberty here in the United States, as Alexander Hamilton liked to describe it.

Since winning their freedom Greece and its citizens have continually contributed and participated in democracy around the world. They fought on the side of the Allied Forces in World Wars I and II and following the Second World War they fought valiantly to keep their hard-won liberties by defeating the Communist insurgents and thus reinforced their intense desire for independence.

Here in the United States the presence of hundreds of thousands of Greek Americans has contributed an added dimension as exemplified so outstandingly by my distinguished colleague from Florida, to the dynamics of American society and self-government.

So as we observe Greek Independence Day let us all remember the significance of this day and its bearing on world freedom.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman for his complimentary remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Greek war of independence is full of heroes and heroism. The roles of the Philhellenes—friends of the Greeks—were instrumental in recognition of the importance of this struggle to Europe, and to fledgling republics. The legacy of Lord Byron is still inscribed indelibly in the history of the Philhellenes. If you find yourself one day in Greece, travel to Cape Sounion, where the Temple of Poseidon can be found. The temple stands on a promontory, gazing over a sea of azure blue that no doubt moved Byron to carve his initials in one of the temple columns. You can still see them there today: a moment in Greek history that

breathes new life every time a hand is run over the smooth, weathered marble.

In that brief instant when history lives, you can see them in the mist of time: the Klephts, who swept down upon the invaders from the mountains, and turned their mischievous talents to the good of independence. You can feel the sea breeze freshen at your back. The same breeze that the sea captains of Hydra filled their sails with to chase a blockade from their waters. The Hydriots have a hallowed place in the history of a seafaring people. Today, generations of Greek merchant seamen are prepared at the academy which finds its home, so aptly, on Hydra.

At this time, again I would interrupt my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my very close friend and fellow Helene [Mr. GEKAS].

□ 1630

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my years, I have never failed to recall my younger days when this day in the calendar approaches because, unlike most national holidays, or ethnic holidays, as it were, the one in which the independence movement in Greece began also coincides with a high religious event in the calendar of the Greek Orthodox Church. That has a double meaning for us, we who were brought up in the Greek Orthodox tradition.

So it is that on March 25, we youngsters, in church and in Sunday school, could not escape the double meaning of the fact that on that holy day, also was the day that a cleric, in 1821, a man of the robe, arose, lifted a flag declaring independence of that glory that was Greece, and began the movement that later found Lord Byron and the whole Western World as one in support of the revolution against the Ottoman Empire.

So, as I stand here as a Member of Congress, looking back at those days, then a flood of other memories come rushing in that, as I matured, saw where there was a tremendous connection between that isolated moment when Father Germanos raised the flag of independence and July 4, 1776, and how it was that the Jeffersonians and the others who brought forth our democracy, banking on what they had learned about the history of Greece, evolved on our continent with a new brand of democracy and then, 50 years later, those same persons in Greece, on whom were the American frontiersmen dependent, now looked to the American independence movement as reason for their own new emergence into the new society of the New World.

We are indelibly and inexorably intertwined, we Americans of Greek

descent and we Americans of Greek tradition and we Americans of a nation whose fundamental bases were fashioned after those of the cradle of democracy hundreds of years before.

That is why I am particularly grateful to the gentleman for taking this special order. The official RECORD, by now, has to be replete with our prideful remarks, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], but I warrant you that next March 25, we will be back on the floor so that we can relive these precious memories.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, God willing, certainly that will come true, and I appreciate the gentleman's very eloquent remarks.

The most important legacy we have received from the Greeks, however, serves as the foundation for the responsibilities we pursue as legislators. Each time we perform our constitutional duty, we are doing so in the legacy of the ancient Greeks, for the United States Constitution has a rich classical ancestry.

In the American colonial period, during the formative years of the American experiment, no feature was more prominent than the extent to which Greek and Roman sources were cited by the framers of the Constitution. Indeed in this year of the historic 100th Congress, in this 200th anniversary of the founding of our Republic, it's significant that we realize, that the basis for our Constitution derives from Aristotle, was put into practice in ancient Rome, in 18th century England, and in the early state constitutions, before it was given its embodiment by the convention of 1787.

The overriding appreciation was for Aristotle's sense of balance, since the delegates viewed the tyrant and the mob as equally dangerous. Both Madison and John Adams emphasized what Aristotle wrote in "The Politics" that "the more perfect the admixture of the political elements, the more lasting will be the state."

The surprising familiarity with classical analogies and precedents is explained by the publication in January 1787, by John Adams, of his "Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America." The work reached the United States in March, before the opening of the Federal Convention, and was reprinted in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York.

Polybius was of special interest to Adams and the framers of the Constitution as the leading authority on the Greek city-states. John Adams said of Polybius,

Though seldom quoted as a legislator, he appears to have considered this subject, and to have furnished arguments enough forever to determine the question.

Polybius tells us in his "Histories" that the best government is that which consists of three forms, kingly

government, aristocracy, and democracy. History and the American experiment have taught us that the best form of government is that which is compounded of all three.

Centuries later, Montesquieu would repeat the lessons of ancient Greece and Rome by stating that the vice of kingly government is monarchy; that of aristocracy, oligarchy; that of democracy, rage and violence; into which, in process of time, all must degenerate.

It has become clear that not only was there a system of checks and balances, but a separation of powers. Polybius left no doubt in his statement that:

When one part, having grown out of proportion to the others, aims at supremacy and tends to become too dominant . . . none of the three is absolute . . .

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would interrupt my remarks by yielding to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I stand here proudly to help honor the freedom and independence won by Greece. In my home State of Maryland, we have a rich heritage of many ethnic communities contributing to the prosperity of the State. The Greek community is prominent in the great free State of Maryland.

I am particularly interested in participating in this special order in recognition of Greek Independence Day, not as a Greek, but as one who belongs to the Greek Orthodox Church, because our ancestry was similar. I am of Serbian parentage and the Serbian Orthodox and Greek Orthodox churches are identical except for language. Wherever I have lived, there has been Greek Orthodox churches and clergy, but not Serbian, so I have always belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church.

Only in America can be found a continuation of cultures from throughout the world. Because of our basic right of personal freedom, every individual may practice their religion and heritage. The United States has a long history of offering support to foreign nations faced with the threat of losing their independence. And rightly so. When America was struggling as a new nation, France offered assistance.

Because of our allies' help, we have been in a position to help other struggling nations preserve their freedom and home rule. Today, we can join our Greek neighbors in celebrating Greek independence.

Greece was first recognized by world powers as an independent nation in 1829 when Russia and Turkey signed the Treaty of Adrianople. This treaty came at the end of four centuries of Ottoman rule. Greek society was no longer polarized.

Independence of Greece came only after a long history of rule by an outside force and, even when independence was won, foreign domination and control continued to threaten this precious freedom. Western civilization first learned of democracy from Greece. It was in Athens, Greece, where civilization first practiced the earliest form of rule by democracy. The world has much to owe to Greek civilization.

At the latter part of the Ottoman Empire, the church emerged as a powerful political and social force in Greece. Greek culture endured during the slow deterioration of the Ottoman Empire. Greece suffered economic pressure as a result of increased taxation, corruption, and military defeats.

As the European Community and the United States experienced prosperity during the 18th century, Greece was marked by economic stagnation. Greek merchants visiting or trading in European countries became increasingly aware of the contrast and their dissatisfaction became fire for a revolution.

Many European leaders provided encouragement for a fight for Greek independence. The Greek Revolution soon followed. In the Greek revolution, Greeks not only fought Turkey but also each other. European powers, including Great Britain, France, and Russia, intervened and established an independent Greece in 1829. England was concerned that Russia might gain a foothold in Greece and thus endanger the British commercial lifeline which ran through the Mediterranean Sea. It has been stated that, without the intervention of the European powers, the Greeks would have never won.

Russia, England, and France sent a joint naval force which destroyed the Turkish-Egyptian fleet in the Bay of Navarino. A treaty was signed and Greek independence was won.

Keeping Greece independent and free from the threat of an oppressive foreign force should be one of the foremost policies of the United States. Greece is a strategic point for the world's major shipping. Located in the Mediterranean, ships must pass Greece to reach the Aegean Sea which leads to the Black Sea. Russia is located on the Black Sea. Maintaining a free shipping lane is of great importance to the free world.

The United States is in a position to implement effective policies designed to strengthen our independence. Reflecting on the history of Greece we can understand the importance of maintaining a capable naval force and to work for an effective trading policy to assist in achieving a healthy economy. These policies are essential to preserving our most precious commodity, freedom.

We can be proud indeed of how all Greeks since then have cherished that freedom. In Maryland we have an impressive Greek-American community, one of which we equally are proud—because they are proud of all their freedom.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland.

By May 1787 the topic of confederation and leagues of States had become a favorite for the delegates. Alexander Hamilton wrote that the:

Leagues among the old Grecian republics were continually at war with each other, and for want of a union, fell prey to their neighbors.

This is why the states of Greece were splintered by Philip of Macedon and afterward by the Romans—because they contended for freedom separately.

In the *Continentalist* of 1781 Hamilton wrote:

The commonwealths of Greece were a constant scene of the alternate tyranny of one part of the people over the other.

In a memorandum he prepared for the convention, we see the recurring theme: the desire for a mixed government. Hamilton saw the articles of confederation as no more stable than the confederation of Greek city states, for he saw the dangers of a State within a State. The city states had ample powers to declare war and use force against delinquent members, but these powers were self destructive in the context of unity. The ancient democracies resulted in tyrannies, and resulted in the illusion of democracy.

Lycurgus, to avoid the anarchy into which these governments surely would degenerate, united in one all the advantages and properties of the best governments, to the end that no branch might degenerate into the tyranny that accompanied its excesses.

The question of the Amphyctionic Council and the precedent it set for the Bicameral Legislature is clear. In the opinion of the delegates, the executive represented the monarchical power, the Senate the aristocratical, and the House the popular power.

These analogies could be continued forever. Incomplete as this brief history is, it supports the contention that the framers of the Constitution were eager to relate the American experiment with the efforts of the ancient Greeks to establish a balance of powers. Such a relation, it was hoped by the framers, would enable America to escape the disintegration of government that had inevitably proven politically fatal throughout history.

It is the example of the ancient Greeks that we celebrate during the bicentennial of the Constitution, and it is the return of democracy to Greece that we rejoice in on this day of glory for the Greek people. The spirit of

March 25 lives on in defense of the principles for which so many of the free world's citizens have given their lives.

□ 1640

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding on this very auspicious occasion.

I had the privilege and honor of sharing with the gentleman last year's commemoration. On that occasion it was the 165th anniversary; today we celebrate the 166th anniversary of a glorious heritage, a great republic, and we are, I think, all indebted to the gentleman for his statement and summation that in this year we are honoring the writing of the Constitution, that is, the 200th anniversary of it. What the gentleman says is most apt, and I am very much impressed by his correlating the tremendous input into the deliberations by such men as John Adams and others, who were great scholars of the Greek philosophers and the Greek experience in government.

John Adams was in London at the time as our Minister, and he became concerned and wrote a very extensive missive that was immediately printed and reprinted in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia in which he alluded to the experience of government. And after all, it was Aristotle and the Greek philosophers who coined the word, "republic." I think that we owe a great debt of gratitude for this reservoir of knowledge that has been brought into the RECORD today on this occasion.

I would merely like to comment that in our day and time, in our great country, a pluralistic, cosmopolitan Nation, it has been those of Greek heritage who have contributed tremendously to the enlargement of the democratic process.

Few people would realize that my native city of San Antonio would have given hospitality for quite a number of years to Greek-descended individuals and actually Greek immigrants. We have a very substantial Church of the Greek Orthodox, St. Sophia, in San Antonio. About one-third of my neighbors and playmates were of Greek heritage, so I had occasion to become exposed to a very, very deep cultural strain of rich inheritance in religion, in philosophy, and in culture, and I only wish that we had had an opportunity while in school to have studied and gained some management of the language.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for giving us the opportunity to mark on this occasion, the 25th of March, a

very significant historical achievement, one that in the annals of humanity's struggle for freedom looms large. I thank the gentleman for having given me this opportunity to share a few minutes with him.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for sharing in this very proud celebration. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has always done a wonderful job and has shown his love for our people.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to mark this special occasion—Greek Independence Day. This is an occasion when all free men can honor the country that gave birth to democracy.

Although Greece had a long period of democracy, that land fell under the rule of the Ottomans.

Finally, after 400 years of foreign control, the Greek people fought and won their liberation from Turkish domination.

It is important to note that the American Revolution became one of the ideals of the Greeks as they struggled for freedom. American volunteers sailed to Greece to participate in Greece's War for Independence.

The Greek War of Independence inspired other people who suffered under the yoke of foreign control.

Today, as we celebrate the Hellenic revolution, all of us can honor those Greeks who fought for the torch of freedom.

We also honor the close bonds that have developed between Greece and America. Our two nations share the ideals of democracy and independence.

I hope that these ties can be strengthened. I am convinced that because of that strong bond we can, working together, resolve the ongoing crisis in Cyprus. I only regret that more emphasis has not been placed on finding a solution to that human tragedy.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in celebrating Greek Independence Day.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of March 25, 1987, as "Greek Independence Day: A national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy." Signed by the President last October, the joint resolution celebrates the interconnection of Greek and United States democracy, a bond which has shaped the histories and futures of each of our nations.

Each country has shared valuable ideals and visions in the development of the other. Ancient Greek democratic rule served as an instructive analogy to our forefathers in the structure of the United States Government. So in turn, the American Revolution became one of the ideals of the Greeks fighting for independence in the 1820's as well as the translation of the United States Declaration of Independence into Greek to be used as their own declaration. And of course, most every aspect of American life has been influenced by Greek literature, law, religion, and art. Our two cultures share a unique and strong bond of mutual admiration and respect.

March 25, 1987, marks the 166th anniversary of the revolution freeing the Greek people from nearly 400 years of rule under the Ottoman Empire. From the fall of Constantinople

in 1453 through the declaration of independence in 1821, Greeks suffered through severe deprivation of their rights and liberties. Rightfully, those were restored and the nation now shares in the American good fortune of living in freedom. With approximately 40 percent of the world living with no measure of freedom, we thankfully recognize the bond of independence we share with Greece and other free nations. I am confident the compatibility of Greeks and Americans will continue to grow throughout history in celebration of our mutual democracies.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring March 25 as Greek Independence Day, a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy.

More than 2,000 years ago the early Greeks formed the first democratic republic, where power was placed in the hands of the whole people. Democracy was born of a trust in human excellence and man's unique ability to think and act rationally. The Greeks believed man capable of bringing good government and justice to a people and nation.

The ingenuity of the ancient Greeks has made a lasting and monumental impression upon the history of the Western world, and has paved the road to modern democracy.

As recipients of this great Greek legacy, we recognize and cherish the virtues of democracy. Democracy provides an environment for high human achievement and realization of our greatest potential, and encourages active and responsible participation in one's own government. We honor democracy as a fair and accessible form of government.

Today marks the 166th anniversary of the signing of the Greek Declaration of Independence; 166 years ago the Greeks reclaimed their democratic heritage.

Today, on Greek Independence Day, we celebrate our past and present close ties with Greece. As Americans we have witnessed and experienced the hard work and perseverance necessary to maintain a democracy, as have the Greeks. We realize that democracy is not to be taken for granted, and that the ideals of democracy must be practiced and shown workable. In celebration of Greek Independence Day, we acknowledge the triumphant history of democracy and look forward to continued friendly relations with Greece and her people.

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my Greek-American constituents today in commemorating the 167th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. I join them in remembering the sacrifices made by the Greek people in their struggle to reignite the flame of freedom and democracy during the Greek war of independence.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek people rose in rebellion against the Ottoman rulers and declared their independence, sparking a 7-year struggle to retain the values and freedoms that have been associated with the Greek people since ancient times. One hundred and sixty-seven years later, I join with Greeks around the world in paying tribute to the Greek people for their dedication and perseverance in this and subsequent struggles. It is their commitment to the concepts of freedom and democracy that has enabled the ac-

complishment of so many advances in the areas of art, architecture, literature, government, and the sciences.

As we recall 1821, I urge my colleagues to also reflect on the plight of the thousands of Greek Cypriots who are to this day continuing their struggle for peace and stability on Cyprus. It has been 13 years since the Turkish armies invaded Cyprus and produced a harsh partition of the island.

I hope that the fierce tenacity and vibrant love of independence which was so evident in 1821 will also be beneficial to the Greek Cypriots as they persevere through diplomatic means to remove the grip of the conquering Turkish armies. I join in celebrating this joyous anniversary and commend this memorable reminder of one nation's struggle for freedom to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. Speaker, today is Greek Independence Day, and I'm proud to join in this national celebration of Greek and American democracy.

Two hundred years ago, our Founding Fathers turned to ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy. Both James Madison and Alexander Hamilton wrote about the strong influence of the Grecian republics on American democracy, and Thomas Jefferson credited the ancient Greeks for leading early America to the light of democratic principles.

Throughout its history, Greece has never lost its longstanding appreciation and tradition for democracy. Despite being ruled by the Ottoman Empire for 400 years, Greece regained its independence in 1821 and translated the United States Declaration to use as its own. By recognizing the success of our democracy, Greece was drawn back to its own ancient political and philosophical tradition.

There has always been a special bond between the people of the United States and the people of Greece. Many United States citizens sailed to Greece to help the Greek people in their war of independence in the 1820's, and several thousand Greek families emigrated to America during the early 1900's. The United States and Greece fought together in World War II, and both countries have battled against Communist rebels. The people of both countries cherish their freedom and their shared democratic principles.

Greek culture has always been an important part of American life. Our laws, our literature, our religion, and our art have been touched by Greek tradition, and it is a tradition that promotes our intelligence and ingenuity.

As an honorary member of the Order of AHEPA in Springfield, I'm particularly proud of the close-knit Greek community in my local area. I'm hoping to participate in Springfield's Greek Orthodox and Order of AHEPA Independence Day to be held this summer. I join my colleagues in the Congress in congratulating all Greek Americans on this special occasion.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was in the Greek tradition that our Constitution was conceived. Today we celebrate Greek Independence Day and the tradition upon which America was built. We can trace the origins of American democracy to the ambitions of the ancient Greeks, who believed that power was in the hands of the people, and that everyone is equal before the law.

On this special day there's much for all Americans to be proud of. As we commemorate Greek and American democracy, we remember the bond between the American tradition and Greek thought—a tie which influenced our literature, our art, and the principles of the American way of life. In modern times, Greece has continued in this great tradition, contributing international leaders in science, art, medicine, and politics.

I look forward to the celebrations that will take place in the coming years, in honor of Greek Independence Day. Certainly, the Greek people have only begun to make their contribution to the world. We should all be thankful for the Greek spirit which was the foundation for American democracy. Let's join the Greek-American community in its well deserved celebration.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in commemorating today, March 25, as the 166th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. Today we are celebrating Greek Independence Day, a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy.

Both of our great nations owe much to the other in the forming and reforming of our democracies. The Greeks were the original leaders in democracy. Two thousand years ago, Greeks were celebrating a government "of the people, by the people and for the people." It was this Greek concept of equality under the law and before the law that provided the foundation for our own Constitution. In this year when we celebrate the bicentennial of our Constitution, it is important that we recognize those who made this Constitution possible. We are a relatively young nation. We owe our success and strength not only to our Founding Fathers, and our citizens, but also to the ideas of many nations who preceded us.

What is remarkable about the history of Greek and American democracies is that each has influenced the other. While our Founding Fathers drew some of their ideas from the ancient Greeks, the American Revolution, and our Declaration of Independence became models for the Greeks as they fought for their independence in the 1820's. It is this sharing of ideas and ideals which has strengthened the relations between our nations.

The influx of Greek immigrants in the early 1900's also strengthened this bond of friendship. Two Greek Americans I would like to recognize are Dr. George Papanicolaou—who invented the pap test for cancer—and Dr. George Kotzias—who developed L-dopa to combat Parkinson's disease. These great doctors have contributed much to the diagnosis and treatment of two of our most dreaded diseases.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on an injustice which mars this celebration. Since 1974, Turkish troops have occupied Cyprus. Currently, before Congress there is legislation which I cosponsored, H.R. 957, which would prevent Turkish occupying forces from receiving any United States assistance. Today, I again call upon Turkey to remove their troops from Cyprus. It is my steadfast hope that when, a year from now, we again

celebrate Greek Independence Day, Cyprus will be joining in this celebration.

Greece and the United States—our dedication to democracy united us and keeps us united in our effort to ensure freedom and liberty for all. I join with my colleagues in celebrating Greek Independence Day—may we have many more such occasions to celebrate.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today as we commemorate Greek Independence Day, a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy. Today marks the 166th anniversary of Greek independence, the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. As a cosponsor of the legislation which establishes this commemoration, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for organizing the special order.

The ties between the people of America and the people of Greece are strong and are reinforced on a number of levels. The democracy which we practice here in the United States has its roots in the ideals and the government of the ancient Greeks. The concept that the power of government derives from the people and that equality exists between citizens, can be traced back to ancient Greece.

In more modern times, the brave soldiers of Greece and America have fought side by side against tyranny. Furthermore, there are many successful Americans of Greek ancestry. As the Representative of the Ninth Congressional District of New York, I know first hand that many of my constituents emigrated from Greece to the United States and helped build a strong and prosperous America.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we are commemorating the struggle which occurred 166 years ago when the Greek people regained their freedom. Their struggle was similar to our own fight 210 years ago when we gained our independence from Great Britain. The commitment of Greece and America to freedom serves as an example and a hope to people throughout the world who are battling oppression and fighting for freedom and self determination.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I take great pleasure in marking the 166th anniversary of the independence of Greece. In politics and culture, philosophy, and the arts, all Americans are indebted to the contributions of Greek civilization and the Greek people, in ancient times and today.

The greatest legacy of Greek civilization lies in its contributions to government. Democracy first flourished in ancient Greece, and we have patterned our own form of democratic government on the model first established in ancient times. Two thousand years ago the great Athenian statesman Pericles articulated principles which even today we still strive to achieve:

We are called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not the membership of a particular class, but the actual ability the person possesses.

This political relationship comes a full circle when we consider the efforts of latter-day Greeks to obtain their independence, the anniversary of which we celebrate today. In their struggle in the 1820's, the Greek revolutionaries took the American revolution as a model for their own struggle. Greek intellectuals translated the Declaration of Independence and used it as their own declaration. A Greek commander in chief declared: "We shall initiate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you, citizens of America."

The contributions of the Greek people to American society continue to this day. By 1970, the children and grandchildren of Greek immigrants had achieved the highest median educational attainment levels of any American ethnic group. Today Greek Americans play a prominent role in every aspect of American society: In politics, Greek Americans are represented in Congress and in State and city houses of the Nation; in the performing arts and higher education; and in every other field ranging from medicine to philosophy. Their contribution to American life and culture has been immense. I believe that all Americans should recognize that contribution.

Again, I proudly join my colleagues in recognizing March 25, 1987, as Greek Independence Day—a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on this date in 1821, Alexander Ypsilanti raised a flag and declared Greece independent from oppressive rule under the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Turks had ruled Greece for more than 400 years, and Ypsilanti's gesture began an 8-year struggle for Greece's recognition as an independent nation. Today, we recognize March 25, 1821, as the beginning of Greek independence and celebrate that nation's 166th anniversary. As Americans, we are proud of our origins of independence and our democratic government. We must not forget, however, that our model for freedom originated in ancient Greek society.

Our debt to the Greek people goes far beyond the beginnings of democracy and the basis for our system of government. Greek influence has helped shape what we know as art, drama and philosophy, and that influence has stood the test of time. We are not the only Nation indebted to the Greeks; their influence is recognized worldwide.

It is also an appropriate moment to recognize that the world is becoming a smaller place. Modern travel and technology continually bring us closer and closer to our world neighbors. Although relations may not have been smooth in the past, our future with modern Greece can be bright in this era, as it is becoming more and more necessary to maintain international friendship. There are more than 3 million Greek Americans in our Nation—a true 20th century statement that the cultures can coincide.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 166th anniversary of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire. I join my colleagues in celebrating this historic event and the heroic legacy of the Greek people.

While many Americans may not realize it, Greece is the birthplace of American democracy.

Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses.

One might think this statement was made by Thomas Jefferson, James Madison or even by an American living today. But it wasn't. Pericles made these remarks in an address in Greece some 2,000 years ago.

On a more contemporary note, Thomas Jefferson said "to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves—American colonists—out of gothic darkness." His colleagues, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton wrote in the *Federalist Papers*, "among the confederacies of antiquity the most considerable was that of the Grecian republics * * * from the best accounts transmitted of this celebrated institution it bore a very instructive analogy to the present confederation of the American states."

The United States, in turn, provided a role model for Greek independence. Our revolution became one of the ideals of the Greeks as they fought for their independence in the 1820's. Greek intellectuals translated our Declaration of Independence and used it as their own declaration. Many volunteers from America sailed to Greece to participate in Greece's war for independence.

Today, the close friendship between Greece and the United States remains strong. Greece is a member of NATO and hosts important American military facilities. The economic, social and cultural ties grow stronger every day. Greek-Americans have provided great services to both countries. It is only befitting that Americans join their Greek friends in celebrating this joyous occasion. I look forward to celebrating many more March 25ths.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 166th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from 400 years of rule by the Ottoman Empire.

That revolution's valorous spirit was replicated a century later during World War II, when over 600,000 Greeks—almost 10 percent of the entire population of Greece—died fighting on the side of the allies.

After World War II, Greece engaged in an arduous and ultimately victorious struggle against Communist rebels. President Eisenhower said of the success of that struggle.

Greece asked no favor except the opportunity to stand for those rights in which it believed, and it gave to the world an example of battle * * * that thrilled the hearts of all free men and free women everywhere.

Today we celebrate and honor that dedication to freedom and democracy that has been the great gift of Greece to the world for thousands of years. It was that spirit of democracy that inspired the birth and ideals of the American nation. And as democracy flourished in America, it was that spirit that led millions of Greeks to emigrate to this country and enrich it with their many talents. Later, that same spirit enabled Greeks to reestablish democra-

cy in their homeland and safeguard it in the mid-20th century.

Today we celebrate the blessings of liberty that have been so hard won by both Greece and America, and we especially celebrate the partnership that both our peoples have been able to forge to protect and promote those blessings for ourselves and our posterity. I am honored to join in that celebration.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, democracy is a privilege that too few of this world's inhabitants enjoy. While we here in the United States have worked hard and fought for a democracy that has lasted over 200 years, many nations have not been so fortunate.

Today, however, we celebrate the anniversary of another long lasting democracy. Greece, which wrestled independence 166 years ago from the Ottoman Empire, is a stellar example of that nation devoted to the preservation of democratic ideals. While many Third World and European nations have juggled governments and constitutions, Greece has stood above, resisting temptation from Communist factions, to maintain a special liberty.

Like many congressional districts, mine contains a significant number of Greek immigrants. Their patriotism and dedication to democracy in this country is a mirror of the model set by their Greek forefathers. Not surprisingly, Greek Independence Day holds a special place in their hearts and minds. Moreover, this is a day for all free people to celebrate and to remember the sacrifices made by those to keep democracy vibrant throughout the world.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, 166 years ago today the Greek struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire began. It is an anniversary both to commemorate and celebrate, because of the universal legacy of Greek history and because of the many contributions people of Greek heritage have made to American society and culture.

The early strivings for a democratic form of government in Athens, enhanced by the writings of Plato and Aristotle, provided the basis for much of the best of Western civilization as we know it today. The Greek struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire was, in many respects, modeled upon the first successful war of liberation against colonial empire—our own struggle for independence from the British Empire.

In World War II more than 600,000 Greeks—almost 9 percent of the total population—died in the struggle against Fascist aggression. In the years since they have sought to maintain their freedom and independence against a succession of threats, both external and internal. Their current Prime Minister, Dr. Andreas Papandreu, is a brilliant man who has been a major force for sanity in the diplomacy of that region in recent years. I am also proud to note that, while he was living in forced exile in this country, he was a precinct worker in my first campaign for Congress in 1970.

For almost two centuries the Greek community in America has been a vibrant force in many facets of the collective life of this Nation. In my own congressional district Greek-Americans have made outstanding con-

tributions to the betterment of our society. The Greek Orthodox Church in Oakland has played a leading role in promoting humanitarian causes. The annual Greek Festival in Oakland is a living testimonial to the diversity and the richness of our polyglot society and culture.

Many individual Greek-Americans have also made major contributions to making America a better place in which to live and work. One of the foremost is State Senator Nicholas Petris. Born and raised in Oakland, after law school he returned to work for the people as a community lawyer. For more than two decades he has been an outstanding member of the California State Legislature. He is a man of high principle and impeccable integrity, in both his public and private life. He truly represents the best that the Greek community has to offer to America. All of us in America should be both proud and grateful for the contributions he and they have made through the years.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, today, we join with the people of Greece and with Greek Americans in celebrating the 166th anniversary of the start of the revolt against the Ottoman Empire which culminated with the establishment of an independent state of Greece.

This day, March 25, also holds a special significance to those of us in America for we owe a debt of gratitude to ancient Greece, where the roots of democracy began.

Through the years of independence of both the United States and Greece, the two nations have enjoyed a close relationship. This special kinship with the people of Greece has been further benefited by the priceless Greek influence, both ancient and modern, on American society today, and by the immense contributions made by immigrants from Greece over the last century. The greatness that is inherent in the Greek culture, in philosophy, science, mathematics, and arts and industry, has been passed on to those of Greek origin who reside in the United States.

As the Greek people all over the world reflect upon their heritage and celebrate their long and glorious history, they can also point with pride at their devotion to maintaining those ideals which all free people hold in such high regard. It is important to pause on occasions such as these to recall that man's philosophical and moral birth began with the ancient Greeks, and for that we must be eternally grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I salute my many friends in the Greek-American community and I join with them in celebrating Greek Independence Day.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in recognizing 166 years of Greek independence.

We owe much to the Greeks. Greece was the birthplace of democracy. And just as we have borrowed the principle of democracy from the Greeks, so have the Greeks used us as a role model for their independence in the 1820's. It is that freedom which we celebrate today.

Greek-Americans have made many contributions: in the arts, in medicine, and yes—in government. I can point with pride to a Greek-American of note in my home State of South Carolina: Lt. Gov. Nick Theodore. Nick is a

highly respected public servant of whom all Greek-South Carolinians can be proud.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to convey my best wishes to my Greek-American constituents. May this date serve as an annual reminder of our shared love of freedom!

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 166th anniversary of the independence of Greece from the Ottoman Empire.

It is to the ancient Greeks that Thomas Jefferson stated "We are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness." As the birthplace of democracy, Greece provided the ideals upon which our Founding Fathers based the foundation of our Government. James Madison and Alexander Hamilton acknowledged this contribution to our democratic ideals when they wrote, "Among the confederacies of antiquity, the most considerable was that of the Grecian republics * * *. From the best accounts transmitted, it bore a very instructive analogy to the present confederation of the American States."

Greece continues to serve as an example to those who value "power in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people," in the words of Pericles from 2,000 years ago. Almost one-tenth the population of Greece perished fighting the oppression of Nazi rule in World War II. In its struggle against Communist rebels after World War II, the spirit and courage displayed by the people of war-torn Greece was so inspiring that President Harry S. Truman said, "The valor of Greece * * * convinces me that the Greek people are equal to the task." So convinced was President Truman by the noble battle of the Greeks to repel Communist rule that he instituted the Marshall plan, which is widely credited with saving Western Europe's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Greece today is an important NATO ally of the United States, anchoring the southern flank of Europe against Warsaw Pact aggression. Here in the United States we owe our most precious asset to the Greeks, the ideals of democracy from which our rule of the people and by the people has emanated. For this gift the people of the United States will always be indebted.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate Greek Independence Day, the 166th anniversary of the Greek Revolution. On March 25, 1821, the Greek patriot Alexander Ypsilanti proclaimed Greek independence after four centuries of occupation and oppression under the Ottoman empire. His declaration of independence ignited a fight for freedom that was to last for 7 long and difficult years and would be ranked among the most glorious pages of Greek history.

This struggle caught the attention of the world. From the free nations of Europe and America, hundreds of volunteers made their way to Greece to join the fight against oppression, the best known of them Lord Byron. In America, the exploits of the Greek patriots inspired John Adams, who claimed, "My old imagination is kindling into a kind of missionary enthusiasm for the cause of the Greeks." In his 1822 message to our predecessors in the 17th Congress, President Monroe exclaimed "The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments." * * * A

strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence, and resume their equal station among the nations on the Earth."

The support of free peoples was more than rhetorical. On October 20, 1827, the navies of Britain, France, and Russia destroyed the Turkish fleet at the battle of Navarino. This victory helped to prepare the way for the eventual Greek victory in 1829.

Mr. Speaker, we are honoring more today than the heroic deeds of the Greek patriots, we are honoring a shared tradition of democracy between our two nations, a tradition that was explicitly recognized in the legislation designating this day as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." As we honor the freedom of the Greek people, we celebrate the rebirth of democracy in the land where democracy began, which gave democracy its name, and which inspired Americans in our own struggle for independence.

"Our constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of a whole people." These are not the words of our Founding Fathers but of the Greek statesman Pericles, speaking 2,000 years ago. But our Founding Fathers heard these words and acted on them in our own struggle for freedom. The thoughts of Pericles and other ancient Greek statesmen and philosophers find expression in our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution. As Thomas Jefferson said, "To the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

As an American of Greek descent, I am especially proud to speak today in celebration of Greek Independence Day. I am pleased that relations between our countries, which have been sometimes strained in recent years, are generally moving into what President Papanastasiou called calmer waters. Today, as we celebrate our ties of friendship and democratic tradition, let us work to build upon them to forge even stronger and more productive links between our countries in the future.

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 166th anniversary of the declaration of Greek independence from Ottoman rule. It is only fitting that we take a moment to recognize the achievement of freedom of a people who have contributed so much to the meaning of the very word.

Greece is often referred to as "the Birthplace of Democracy." The origin of the word "democracy" is actually Greek, meaning "the state of the people." Throughout history the Greek people have demonstrated an unwavering commitment to this ideal. From Aristotle to Alexander, from Plato to Pericles, the emphasis of the Greek leader, intellectual, or citizen was on the achievement of a just state where freedom was equal for all.

This ideal was kept alive during the 400 Dark Years in which Greece was under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The slogan of the Greeks during this time was, "It is better to live 1 hour in freedom than 40 years in slavery and in prison." Through their undying belief in the importance of freedom they were able to reclaim it for themselves.

It is my sincere hope that, on this anniversary of Greek independence, each and every one of us takes a moment to reflect on the courage of the Greek people in defending democracy, and also to remember that in the world today a large number of oppressed people are unable to do the same.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, today, I join hundreds of Greek-Americans in Delaware County in celebration of 166 years of freedom for the Greek people. On March 25, 1821, four centuries of Ottoman rule ended when freedom-loving Greeks rose up in arms and fought valiantly for one of life's most precious gifts—liberty.

As Americans, we pay tribute to the Greeks for their dedication and perseverance. The events of March 25 will be celebrated today in schools and Greek Orthodox parishes throughout the Delaware Valley. The Greek spirit which did not tolerate domination, should be celebrated by all in America and not just by those of Greek descent. The Hellenic spirit must not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, we pause today to pay tribute to the Greek people because they have demonstrated a collective will to fight for what some may take for granted in this country: freedom. The lessons of history are available for decisionmakers today. The richness of the Greek experience must not only be preserved; it must be shared.

No one can deny the positive impact the Hellenic tradition has had on America. Our political values have been shaped largely by the Greek philosophers of old. American architecture, literature, art, and music constantly remind us of Greek influence.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the occasion of Greek Independence Day should remind all Americans of the many blessings we share, and the positive influence of Greek Americans on our society.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to share in the celebration of a country's long and hard struggle to overcome 400 years of oppression, in the name of freedom, precious freedom.

I join the Greeks in celebrating their independence day, the 166th anniversary of Greece's liberation from the Ottoman Empire.

On this day last year, President Reagan signed into law the resolution to designate March 25 as Greek Independence Day, a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy. Greek Independence Day is indeed symbolic of the triumph of democracy in two parts of the globe.

Greeks and Americans have throughout history served one another as role models in constructing democracy. The American revolution inspired the Greeks as they fought for their freedom in the 1820's. We recall also the many American volunteers who participated in Greece's war for independence.

As Americans we must be reminded that our Founding Fathers often looked to the Greeks in their design for a democratic form of government. James Madison and Alexander Hamilton frequently referred to the Grecian republics as model institutions of government. Thomas Jefferson once remarked that, "To the ancient Greeks * * * we are indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

Greek Independence Day is a celebration of freedom—freedom—the most basic of all human rights.

The Greek triumph should be an inspiration for oppressed people throughout the world in their struggle to attain the most basic of all human rights, precious freedom.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to honor Greek Independence Day today. My congressional district contains many Greek Americans. The concepts of freedom and democracy first laid down by ancient Greece are the same concepts upon which our Government was founded. As Thomas Jefferson said, "To the ancient Greeks . . . we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves (American colonies) out of Gothic darkness."

Today, Greece is a NATO ally. But Greece was ruled by the Ottoman Empire for almost 400 years—from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 until the declaration of independence in 1821. Her struggle was of deep concern in the United States, as expressed by President James Monroe in his message to Congress in 1822. He said, "A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence, and resume their equal station among the nations on the Earth." Their success is the purpose of our celebration today, for as Percy Bysshe Shelley said, "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art have their roots in Greece."

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is eminently appropriate that we set aside time today and every March 25 hereafter to recognize Greek Independence Day, and to reflect on the contributions made by Greek and Greek-Americans in American society. March 25 will stand as a beacon of knowledge in the fog of ignorance; as a torch of culture in the darkness of uncivilization; as a pillar of fortitude—both personal and physical—in the edifice of human interaction. In short, Greeks and Greek-Americans have played a fundamental role in shaping American society in all its facets.

The influence of ancient Greek culture is indelibly suffused into 20th century culture here in the United States as well as most regions of the world. Their lessons continue to be taught and learned directly through study of the great works of Sophocles, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle which have retained immortality through the world's finest learning institutions. The philosophies and reasoning progresses which they developed and epitomized are every bit as relevant today as the day they were created. Their perception of the universe and concepts of the arts constituted a quantum leap toward an ordered society, and established a direction to be followed in many generations to come.

The impact of the ancient Greeks is perhaps most profoundly felt in the domain of national and world politics. Surely it was during that period that the concept of "democracy" became ambulatory and first stretched its legs into the future. As Plato wrote in "The Republic," "Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike." The skeleton which they assembled formed the body of American democracy two millennia later, which in turn became the foundation for democracy in dozens of

countries worldwide—including Greece—in two centuries since.

In the United States, individuals of Greek origin have had a substantial impact in areas which run the gamut of American life. Since the great wave of Greek immigration to the United States in the early 1900's, Greeks have played instrumental roles in the sciences, the government, the military, the arts, and virtually all sectors of the American economy and culture. A recitation of great Greek-Americans is a recitation of great Americans: the family next door just as much as the exceptional leader. To single out a few would be a misnomer: it is a whole people—our people—who have made the contribution.

I am delighted to participate in the recognition of March 25 as Greek Independence Day and all which it represents to American society and to world democracy.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Greek Independence Day, a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy. Some members of the Greek-American community from my home district, the Karakas family, have ancestors who were involved in the struggle for Greek independence.

Today is the 166th anniversary of Greece's independence from the yoke of the Ottoman Empire. The arduous fight of the Greeks against their invaders is no less than a perfect example of the ability to overcome obstacles that appear insurmountable if the will to persevere is strong enough.

The independence of our two countries is inexorably intertwined. Our war for independence became a role model for 19th century Greeks who fought for theirs. Greek intellectuals translated the Declaration of Independence of the United States and used it as their own declaration.

A Greek commander in chief appealed to the citizens of the United States, saying: "Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by a just sympathy since it is in your land that liberty fixed her abode, and by you that she is prized as by our fathers. Hence, honoring her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you."

Mr. Speaker, I join the Greek-American community in my home district, and the Greek-American community in the entire Nation in honoring Greek Independence Day.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join all people of Greek heritage throughout the world, in celebrating, today, March 25, 1987, as the 166th anniversary of Greek independence day.

The concept of democracy, an idea which permeates American life, was born in Greece over 2,000 years ago. The Founding Fathers of our great Nation drew heavily upon the philosophical and political experience of ancient Greece in forming our own Declaration of Independence, and later, the U.S. Constitution.

Today, let us celebrate, with the Greek people, a common heritage of freedom and democracy that both our countries share. By celebrating today as "Greek Independence Day: A Celebration of Greek and American

Heritage" we will be reaffirming our strong allegiance to the principles of democracy which gave birth to our great Nation.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity, to call this celebration to the attention of my colleagues and to join all of the Greek people who are participating in all the festivities of this very special occasion.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, to terminate my remarks, let me say that all of these principles that we have talked about here are truly embodied in the slogan "Eleftheria I' Thanatos"—"Liberty or Death." These principles are not uniquely Greek—in- stead, they are now a legacy which all democracies cherish, and have a responsibility to protect.

A HISTORY OF PAST ATTEMPTS TO HAVE CONTRA ACTIVITIES INVESTIGATED BY A SPECIAL COUNSEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend those members of the Judiciary Committee who joined me in the 99th Congress on October 17, 1986, to request of the Attorney General of the United States that an independent counsel be appointed to pursue the revelations that were coming forward from the downing of a C-123 cargo plane on October 5 of that same year laden with munitions that seemed to have apparently been involved with private efforts to support the Contras.

From this humble beginning and the outpouring of other events related to this, we now find ourselves in the incredible and very difficult situation that now engulfs the executive branch of the Government.

So I wanted to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from California, Mr. DON EDWARDS; the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. BRUCE MORRISON; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GEORGE CROCKETT; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BARNEY FRANK; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ROBERT KASTENMEIER; our former colleague from Ohio, JOHN SEIBERLING; the gentlewoman from Colorado, Mrs. PATRICIA SCHROEDER; the gentleman from California, Mr. HOWARD BERMAN; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN; and the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. STAGGERS. Those colleagues of ours on the Judiciary Committee, it seems to me, have done a very, very important service to this Nation in determining that long ago, some 5 months ago, we were in need of an independent counsel to investigate these activities.

In connection with that petition to the courts and to the Attorney Gener-

al, it was required that we present some theory of the activities that would justify the courts complying with our request that an independent counsel or special prosecutor be appointed. So we had to construct from that point of view some indication of a factual nature as to what may have happened that would require the granting of our request, and I would like now to just go back over that with the Members. We must remember that this was back in October of 1986, and here is the submission that we made to the Department of Justice. We said this:

It has been reported that in December 1983, a series of meetings involving Lt. Col. Oliver North, Central Intelligence Agency Director William Casey, the Vice President of the United States, GEORGE BUSH, then-White House counselor Edwin Meese, then-Interior Secretary William Clark, and President Ronald Reagan and others took place to plan a supply network to the Contras. It is said that these efforts were undertaken in anticipation of congressional prohibitions on aid to the armed rebels.

Lt. Col. Oliver North is reported to have been given principal responsibility in administering the supply operation and is reported to have had frequent contact with the Contras through intermediaries including United States General Retired Singlaub and Robert Owen. Donald Gregg, the Vice President's national security advisor, and Retired General Richard Secord were also detailed to assist the coordination of the network.

It is also reported that the U.S. officials planned to fund the Nicaraguan rebels through highly unusual and illegal methods. On November 25, 1986, Attorney General Edwin Meese acknowledged in a press conference that funds obtained from arms sales to Iran had been "transferred" to the Nicaraguan Contras. Lt. Col. Oliver North and National Security Advisor John Poindexter were said to be immediately involved.

□ 1650

Mr. Speaker, several trips to Iran paid for with United States funds seem to have been made by United States officials or representatives to discuss arrangements. News organizations reported that Chief of Staff Donald Regan had been informed, and approved the details, of the Iran arms sales. It also was reported by news organizations on November 27, 1986, that documents might have been destroyed relating to the arms sales to Iran and benefits from those sales derived and forwarded to the Contras.

The initial supply network plan was reportedly drafted by Lt. Col. Oliver North and to have been approved by then-National Security Council Counselor Robert McFarlane and President Reagan. From 1984 to 1986, when direct or indirect U.S. official involvement with the Contras was prohibited by law, the supply network seems to have flourished. The supply network seemed to involve the use of U.S.

funds at air bases and elsewhere in violation of U.S. law. U.S. officials were alleged to have been involved in, and knowledgeable of, activities that may have constituted felonies including illegal arms shipments, neutrality law violations, foreign agents registration act violations and other criminal acts.

During the 2 years in which legal prohibitions on involvement with the Contras were in place, key individuals who say that they were involved in the supply efforts claimed to have frequent contact with administration officials, and that their activities were known to those officials. General Singlaub, for instance, who acknowledged publicly his principal role in the supply efforts said in a "60 Minutes" interview with Mike Wallace on October 5, 1986, that he kept informed CIA Director William Casey about his activities in supplying the Contras with military aid, and received encouragement from him. There were also reports Singlaub acknowledged clearing his actions with North and meeting frequently with CIA Director William J. Casey. The Hearst Syndicate also reported on May 15, 1986, that General Singlaub, operating with U.S. Government approval, agreed to provide arms and other supplies to Nicaraguan rebel leader Eden Pastora.

Also during the time in which the restrictions were in place, public funds are reported to have been used to assist efforts to supply the Contras. Department of Defense funds are said to have been used to upgrade military airfields at Ilopango in El Salvador, Aguacate, Jamastran, and Mocoron. Funds are also reported to have been used to maintain safehouses, pay telephone bills, and other activities that may be directly related to the supply network. Flight logs also showed that pilots involved in the supply efforts, including one killed in the October 5 downing of the C-123, which had Eugene Hasenfus aboard, had flown to sensitive U.S. military bases, including bases inside the United States where classified military research is conducted.

Individuals receiving public moneys, including official contracts, seem to have been involved in aiding the Contras and administering the supply network. John Hull, an American with CIA connections who lives in Costa Rica, is reported to have received \$10,000 monthly from the NSC in 1984 and 1985 to coordinate Contra operations. It was alleged during that time that Robert Owen, who received contracts from NHAO, used Oliver North's office in his capacity as unofficial liaison to the Contras and fundraiser for them.

It is also reported that Robert Owen worked to aid the Contras through private channels while working as a

consultant to the NHAO at the State Department. Two sources are said to have told Senator KERRY's staff that they witnessed Owen engaged in arranging a weapons transaction with Adolfo Calero in the United States in the period when the Boland amendment was in force.

Illegal arms shipments were alleged to have transpired and the Office of the U.S. Attorney commenced investigation into them in Miami. One such shipment seems to have originated from Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, FL, Airport on March 6, 1985, and was coordinated by John Hull and Robert Owen, who met the shipment at Ilopango military base in El Salvador. Francisco Chanes who is an official of legal humanitarian aid, is also alleged to have been involved in the arms shipment. Any administration involvement in this incident or knowledge of it and failure to report it, could constitute a criminal violation.

Key law enforcement officials, who may have feared public and congressional reaction to revelations of illegalities on the part of the Contras and their associates, may have exerted pressure to slow or halt the investigation at this point. Information obtained by Senator KERRY does not seem to have been acknowledged or acted upon at that time. Two unnamed law enforcement officials in an interview said that Attorney General Meese and former Deputy Attorney General Lowell Jensen applied pressure to slow the investigation of illegal arms shipment from Hollywood Airport.

The C-123 cargo plane, downed on October 5, 1986, revealed additional information. An identification card found in the wreckage of the downed C-123 identified captured flier Eugene Hasenfus as an "adviser" in the "U.S.A." group at the Ilopango air base in El Salvador. Entrance onto the base by Americans was said to require approval by U.S. officials.

Hasenfus, it had been frequently reported, was recruited by members of the network established by the administration. An unnamed Salvadoran familiar with CIA activities in El Salvador and also knowledgeable of the supply operation is quoted as saying "Do you think the Salvadoran Government would let hundreds of guns and big airplanes fly in and out of here for more than a year taking stuff to the guerrillas if the United States Government didn't tell them to?" Approving access to the base maintained with U.S. funds could constitute unauthorized assistance.

Subsequently, Hasenfus is quoted as saying that 24 to 26 CIA personnel acted as flight crews and maintenance crews; that they were also involved in refueling of flights that came through Ilopango, and that they helped create the flight plans. All fuel at Ilopango is

thought to be purchased by either the CIA, the Pentagon, or the U.S. Military Aid Program.

□ 1700

At a press conference, Hasenfus is reported to say that Max Gomez and another CIA employee were responsible for the logistics and flight plans for private Contra supply flights. Mr. Gomez, it is recalled, was recommended by none other than the Vice President of the United States National Advisor, Mr. Donald Gregg, to the Salvadoran Air Force as a counter-insurgency specialist, and the distinguished Vice President of the United States, Mr. Bush and Mr. Gregg, are reported to have met with Gomez on at least two occasions. Mr. Gomez is also reported to have dined with the Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Edwin Corr. The Ambassador stated at one point that he did not know Mr. Gomez. Several days after that statement, an embassy spokesman retracted the Ambassador's comments.

There are indications that U.S. funds were used to support Gomez's activities at a time when such support was specifically prohibited by law. In a report in October 27 of last year, it was stated that three Salvadoran workers were paid by the U.S. Embassy to work on Mr. Max Gomez's house. In addition, the captured flier, Mr. Hasenfus, claims to have stayed at Mr. Gomez's residence located at 5272 Pasco Escalon in San Salvador. When a reporter, an American reporter, attempted to visit the location and gain entry, it is reported that armed security agents carrying U.S. Embassy identification cards appeared promptly at the scene. The reporter was turned away.

Also in October of last year, captured flights and record logs show that at least 15 private flights carrying weapons to resupply the Contras originated at the Honduran military base of Aguacate and some used the airfield at Mocoron, both improved with U.S. military exercise funds. But U.S. spokesmen for the exercises insisted that the airfields were only used to give American soldiers practice in field construction techniques, and said they would not be used for or by the Contras because of laws prohibiting indirect or direct aid to the Contras. Captured flight logs also record trips to highly sensitive U.S. military bases, including one in Nevada that is said to have conducted classified military research.

Nicaraguan troops are said to have recovered a navigational targeting instrument from the cockpit of the plane, which Mr. Hasenfus said was placed there by the Central Intelligence Agency to allow pilots to make more accurate drops of weapons shipments.

Phone bills from a safe house in San Salvador where Mr. Hasenfus and others stayed are reported to show numerous calls to Lieutenant Colonel North's private line at the National Security Council in the Capital of our Nation. The phone records show a series of calls to Mr. North's, Colonel North's office, arms merchants and air supply companies were involved in these telephonic transactions.

It is suspected that the U.S. Government paid for these phone bills.

As unnamed U.S. official is quoted as saying that the Economic Support Funds for El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, had been diverted and were critical to the supply network.

Any number of other events reported, including that of Richard Secord's involvement in arranging for third parties to supply the Contras, including key officials and individuals in Saudi Arabia, in possible exchange for a favorable disposition of the Awac deal of Saudi Arabia have been noted.

It is also reported that the Attorney General of the United States, Edwin Meese, and Deputy Attorney General Donald Jensen applied pressure on the Office of the U.S. attorney to halt or slow the investigation into illegalities emanating out of Contra supply efforts, as it might have interfered with the administration's foreign policy goals.

This, Mr. Speaker, was information that the members of the Judiciary Committee provided the Attorney General and ultimately the three-man Federal court in asking for an independent counsel and suggesting possible alleged illegal efforts by the U.S. officials to assist the Contras that involved such conflicts of duty on the part of the Attorney General and others in the Department of Justice that an independent counsel should be appointed, and I am very, very pleased, of course, to suggest to you that they were appointed and that Mr. Walsh is on the job and is proceeding forthwith.

There was yet another part of our response to the Department of Justice, the request for an independent counsel, that suggested to them as was required under our interpretation of the law to elicit the statutes that might have been violated, what crimes, what criminal statutes might these U.S. Government officials have violated in their over-enthusiastic efforts to assist the Contras. We set forward a number of them.

Among them was title 18, section 641, of the United States Code which refers to the misuse of public money, property or records. This criminal statute provides penalties for the use of Federal money or property without legal authority, specifically for anyone who embezzles, steals, purloins or knowingly converts to his use or the

use of another without authority, sells, conveys or disposes of any record, voucher, money or thing of value of the United States or any property made or being made under contract for the United States or any Department or Agency included within the United States.

Possible violations include approval or authorization by or involvement of Vice President GEORGE BUSH or former Chief of Staff, Mr. Donald Regan, former Head of the CIA, Mr. William Casey, the Head of the Department of Defense, Mr. Caspar Weinberger, the Attorney General of the United States, Edwin Meese, Mr. John Poin-dexter, Mr. William Clark, Mr. Robert McFarlane, Mr. Donald Gregg, Mr. Elliott Abrams, Col. Oliver North, Robert Owen, the U.S. Embassy, Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Defense personnel, referred to as other U.S. officials, to use U.S. funds or equipment for purposes prohibited by law, including the diversion to the Contras or the supply network that supported them of funds obtained through the sale of U.S. arms to the nation of Iran, particularly if U.S. officials arranged or otherwise facilitated the use of public properties, including arms in such a way as to obtain profits to assist the Contras, or trips to Iran by U.S. officials or Representatives paid for with U.S. Government funds for the purpose of arranging arms sales to Iran that would either directly or indirectly ultimately benefit the Contras.

□ 1710

Or the destruction of any documents regarding the sale of arms to Iran, the intended benefits of such a transaction to the Contras, or the involvement in or knowledge of public officials including administration officials in those dealings;

Or the establishment of, or assistance in setting up, Swiss bank accounts to funnel payment to the Contras of U.S. arms sales to Iran;

Or payment of construction, maintenance or other costs for safehouses in Central America used in connection with the private supply network, and payment of telephone bills at those safe houses;

Or unauthorized procurement of fuel for the Contras through the Salvadoran military with foreign aid funds;

Or coordination of supply efforts, including telephone calls and meetings, by U.S. officials and employees at a time when all "direct or indirect" assistance was prohibited by U.S. law;

Or allowing or facilitating the supply operation's use of facilities at airfields in Central America, including Ilopango, Mocoron, Aguacate, and Jamastran, constructed or maintained with U.S. funds;

Or unauthorized provision of U.S. airborne guidance equipment to the supply operation or U.S. officials helping with refueling, flight planning or communications;

Or payment of public funds and contracts to private air freight companies connected to the supply operations, including the well known Southern Air Transport, which has been tied to the downed C-123 cargo plane with Mat Hasenfus aboard; and if those moneys assisted the network in anyway;

Or involvement of any kind in fraud in the disposition of U.S. funds as reported by the General Accounting Office;

Or provision of Nicaraguan Humanitarian Assistance Office [NHAO] funds for purposes prohibited by law to individuals involved with the Contras or Contra supply operations;

Or Department of Defense officials approving construction, improvement, or maintenance of military airbases which assisted the supply operation to the Contras including airbases in Honduras at Aguacate (at an official estimated cost of \$225,000), at Jamastran (at an official cost of \$199,000), at Mocoron (at an official cost of \$225,000) and in El Salvador at Ilopango;

Or diversion of U.S. Economic Support Funds [ESF] through El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras to the supply efforts.

No authority existed for such expenditures and use of public funds and property, and in fact such use was specifically prohibited by section 775 of the fiscal year 1984 Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 98-212), section 105 of the fiscal year 1986 Intelligence Authorization Act (Public Law 99-169), section 8066 of the fiscal year 1985 Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 98-473).

In addition, there are other criminal statutes that members of the executive branch and the U.S. Government may have violated in their activities in efforts to assist the Contras.

Title 18, section 1001 of the United States Code deals with fraud and false statements.

This statute provides criminal penalties for whoever "knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or presentations." Under this section, possible violations could include planning by, involvement in, or knowledge and concealment on the part of U.S. officials cited above together with Richard Secord, John Singlaub, William Cooper, Tom Posey, Filex Rodriguez also known as "Max Gomez," Luis Posada also known as "Ramon Medina," Aristides Sanchez, Mario and Adolfo Calero and others in activities with public funds and properties for purposes prohibited by law, particular-

ly if vouchers or other claims were submitted.

COMMEMORATING 94TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF DRAZA MIHAILOVICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PRICE of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 94th anniversary of the birth of a great hero in the annals of World War II, Draza Mihailovich. It was his fate to be thrust upon the world stage in 1941 with the Nazi invasion of his homeland. And in common with the ideals that finally brought the United States into that conflict, he and his Serbian compatriots fought to secure unto themselves and their posterity, liberty and justice.

As commander in chief of the Yugoslav Army, General Mihailovich assumed the leadership of a movement which has grown up during the war called Ravnogorstvo atop the mountain of Ravna Gora in Serbia. He was heir, in this respect, to a grand Serbian tradition begun in the 14th century on the battlefield of Kosovo when Serbians bravely took up arms against the invading Turks. Although hopelessly outnumbered, on that occasion, and faced with certain defeat, the Serbs nevertheless laid down their lives for preservation of the same ideals the Serbian patriots once more defended in the face of totalitarianism in World War II, liberty and justice.

□ 1720

The Serbs were the first to confront this challenge to Western civilization in the 14th century. Five centuries later, in World War I, they did it again at what was called the Tessaionika front. Driven by this same spirit, General Mihailovich led his people's resistance to the hydra-headed evils of nazism and communism a generation later. General Mihailovich paid for his devotion to freedom with his life. While he triumphed against the Nazis, the twin menace of communism made him one of the first martyrs of the cold war.

General Mihailovich was betrayed because of his commitment to securing liberty and justice for his people. He was the first freedom fighter to expe-

rience the treachery of defeating nazism only to be delivered up as a human sacrifice to its twin, the evil of communism. Tragically, the Western World, still basking in the defeat of Adolph Hitler, turned its face in shameful disregard to the opening round of world war III. Today, we can tally some of the consequences of that betrayal of concern for liberty and justice by looking beyond the Iron Curtain to the slave states of Eastern Europe, the battlefields of Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Angola, Mozambique, and Cambodia, and the systematic genocide perpetrated by the Marxist dictator of Ethiopia.

There is a symbolism to Mihailovich's birthdate of March 27. On that very day, in 1941, the Serbs supported the military coup that occurred in Yugoslavia. It was clear to the Serbs, at that time, as it was to that portion of the royal army loyal to freedom, that war was preferable to a pact with the Nazis.

At that same time, the central committee of the minor Communist Party of Yugoslavia—obeying Stalin's directive—had strenuously urged support for the pact with the Nazis. In fact, they claimed the people were quite willing to surrender their freedom to avoid war.

But the Serbian officers of the regular Yugoslav Army, reflecting the anti-totalitarian spirit of the Serbian people, turned down a nonaggression pact with the Axis powers. This, in turn, resulted in the crucial delay of Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union that ultimately cost him a victory in that campaign. Yet, these same anti-Nazi officers were denounced by the Communists as war criminals.

Perhaps more significant was the fact that on this day, the birthday of Draza Mihailovich, the battle lines were drawn in Yugoslavia between Serbs and Communists that have persisted to this day.

Just a few years earlier, the man called Tito—who would later murder General Mihailovich—published two manifestos in the Swedish Communist newspaper that praised the Nazi and Soviet occupation of the three Baltic States. One of the tragic ironies of the war was that the Nazi sympathizer, Josip Broz Tito, was cosseted by the Allies at the expense of the true allied patriot, Mihailovich, because of Communist penetration of British intelligence during the war. The Yugoslav Royal Army ended up being defeated from within. What the Nazis had been unable to accomplish in the battlefield, Yugoslav Communists achieved from within.

On April 6, 1941, Germany invaded Yugoslavia. Four days later, at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia held in Zagreb, the Yugoslav Communists welcomed the German invaders.

They held Great Britain to be an enemy and expressed the opinion that war against Germany was unnecessary and repugnant.

In spite of this disloyalty to the country, their Colonel Mihailovich, leading the combined unit of the royal army, refused to accept capitulation. Rapidly, his determined resistance grew. In a matter of weeks, his original unit became a well-organized army behind the enemy lines. The outpouring of support for his efforts, on the part of Serbs, was unselfish and spontaneous.

The underground grew in Belgrade and in all the cities and towns of Serbia. Led by Mihailovich the Serbs were the only force in Europe fighting the superior Nazi forces other than the British.

At this point, it is important to review some history surrounding events that are clouded in memory or virtually unknown to a postwar generation. National socialism and communism were ideological cousins. To be sure, there were theoretical differences and they had intramural quarrels, but their common enemy, free societies, enabled them to overlook their differences. Thus, in their mutual quest for world domination, the alliance between Hitler and Stalin to double-team Poland was a natural.

But this collectivist, totalitarian cooperation had existed for years throughout all of Europe. Tito, for example, worked in cooperation with the Nazis as far back as the Spanish Civil War. The Communists in Yugoslavia, who prided themselves on being "the most Stalinist party of Europe," became Hitler's most dependable ally in Yugoslavia after creation of the Soviet-Nazi Pact.

Ribbentrop's top intelligence agent for the Balkans stated after the war that "Tito was our tool." For this reason, the Balkan Bureau of Hitler's foreign ministry arranged for Tito's transit from Switzerland to Yugoslavia to coordinate the Communists in opposition to the Serbian forces which refused to accept Yugoslav capitulation to the Nazis.

Until Hitler's doublecross of Stalin, then, there was tight coordination between the Nazis and the Yugoslav Communists to bring Yugoslavia into the Third Reich. But the Communist hostility toward the freedom loving Serbs who bravely resisted the Nazi invasion did not end once Hitler and Stalin became enemies. Tito issued an order on October 14, 1941, that "the liquidation of all Chetnik bands [Mihailovich's Serbian forces] is as important as the liquidation of the occupiers."

The Yugoslav Communists began a systematic attack on Serbian priests, distinguished citizens, and even the elderly heroes from World War I who had broken the Tessalonika front. On

October 10, 1941, in the Serbian town of Kraqujevack, the Communists provoked a holocaust by killing a handful of the Nazi occupiers. The Nazis retaliated 11 days later by mercilessly killing 7,300 male Serbs, including high school students.

On the heels of this atrocity, Tito declared that the "Yugoslav Communist struggle is no longer a battle against the Axis Powers. At stake is the future political power in the whole country." In response, Tito's Communist supporters, at the end of October, began a full-fledged civil war in Yugoslavia by massacring all of Mihailovich's wounded soldiers at a hospital in Uzice.

Despite these historic facts, this was the very time that Communist disinformation came to twist history in the minds of many until well after World War II had ended. In this respect, the disinformation is not dissimilar from that engaged in by the Communists today with regard to Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Angola and Mozambique. Our own State Department obviously had difficulty sorting out fact from Communist propaganda, for it suppressed the fact until 1967 that General Mihailovich had been recommended to receive this Nation's highest decoration for valor to a nonnational by then Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, and this honor was bestowed by President Harry Truman.

On December 10, 1941, the German high command in Serbia, in a secret report, acknowledged that Mihailovich had escaped a trap they had laid for him. At the same time, in a public declaration announced to the Serbian population by radio and leaflets, Mihailovich was declared a criminal rebel and a reward of 200,000 dinars was posted for his head.

By July 6, 1942, the Comintern's radio, Free Yugoslavia, from Moscow, accused Mihailovich of "collaboration" with the Nazis. Eleven days after this announcement, Heinrich Himmler cabled from Hitler's headquarters in Germany to his commander in Yugoslavia that the basis of success in Serbia and all of southeastern Europe lay in "the annihilation of Mihailovich" at whatever cost.

Ironically, at about this same time, while the White House was praising the outstanding achievements of General Mihailovich and "his daring men," the Communist Daily Worker, in New York City, reported that Mihailovich was a "fascist and traitor."

In the meantime, Ravnogorstvo was bleeding unselfishly in behalf of liberty and justice for all.

During this time, the target of the Yugoslav Communists was not to contribute to the Allied victory in Europe, but to capture General Mihailovich and his supreme command. The objec-

tive of this emphasis was to terminate the Serbian national structure.

Simultaneously, Mihailovich's military, political, and economic intelligence contributed to the Allied cause. For example, it was Mihailovich's intelligence that first informed the Allies about the existence of the V1 bombs which were targeted on London. By contrast, according to the Yugoslav author, Milovan Djilas, "the radio link between the Communist intelligence and German military intelligence was fully operational to the last day of the war."

The Yugoslav Communists joined forces with the Nazi invaders in a combined effort to annihilate the Mihailovich forces and this objective became an all-consuming passion. "Mihailovich and his forces and supporters must be annihilated at any cost," announced Gen. Paul Bader, commandant of Serbia for the Nazis. Just 2 days before this, Radio Free Yugoslavia, from Moscow, was trumpeting the fact that Tito had charged Mihailovich with treason against the Communists. During this same time, January 1943, Mihailovich had successfully tied up three German and six Bulgarian divisions.

One can document endless cases of the treasonous relationship between the Nazis and Tito's Communist forces that culminated in the elevation of Tito to power at the end of World War II and the cruel assassination of General Mihailovich.

But, as Shakespeare wrote, "the past is prologue." At this moment in history, we can publicly honor this betrayed patriot in the fight for liberty and justice he waged so well in war and had stolen from himself and the Serbian people in peace.

But no eulogy to Draza Mihailovich is complete without a final word on his commitment that comes home forcefully to all Americans. At the same time he was being betrayed by Yugoslav Communists, and at the same time he was abandoned by the Allies thanks in large measure to disinformation provided by Communist moles in the British intelligence network, he kept the faith, and he saved the lives of over 500 downed American airmen.

Today, after Communist misrule has reduced the richest country of the Balkans to an economic, political, and moral basket case, we must not forget the enduring Mihailovich legacy. Mihailovich lives in the hearts and minds of people in Serbia today, and also in the hearts and minds of freedom-loving people everywhere as a symbol of the indomitable spirit of man to fight against all odds in behalf of the enduring, noble ideals of liberty and justice.

So as we honor today the birth and life of this great man and those Serbian patriots who paid the last full measure of devotion in behalf of our

heritage of freedom, please join me in a moment of silent prayer that his legacy will remain forever unquenchable, so help us God.

□ 1730

I yield to the distinguished colleague of Serbian extraction from the great State of Maryland, the Honorable HELEN BENTLEY.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank my colleague from Illinois for his relentless battle to gain recognition for this great Serbian general who fought so hard to help the allied cause during the World War II, but was sabotaged and betrayed by his so-called friends.

As the only Serbian American in the Congress I particularly appreciate this cause which the gentleman has laid out so vividly here.

The gentleman has pointed out that we in this country seem to take a perverse pride in finding good things to say about our enemies and ignoring or vilifying our friends. Certainly General Mihailovich was just such a case.

The group which wishes to honor him is not some fringe organization with its own ax to grind. It is a group of men who risked their lives in the Second World War. Shot down over Yugoslavia, they owe their lives to Mihailovich and his Chetniks.

Even after our own leaders had cut him off and begun to support other guerrilla fighters, his Chetniks still continued to rescue downed allied airmen, often at the cost of their own lives. Who better than these men can judge the claim of Mihailovich to be honored by the United States.

We are told that to allow honor to this great man might embarrass us in our relationship with Yugoslavia. We are being asked to perpetuate a slur on his memory and to dishonor those brave men whose lives he saved for the convenience of the State Department. Should we tear down the statues of Baron Von Steuben and General Pulaski lest we offend current Eastern European nations?

One of the men who spearheaded the effort to recognize General Mihailovich was the late Capt. George Musulin who was on an OSS rescue mission code-named Operation Halyard, which evacuated 250 of the American airmen on August 9, 1944, from a makeshift airfield only 80 miles from Belgrade. It was probably the largest and most daring operation of its kind conducted anywhere in axis-occupied Europe during the whole of World War II. Through subsequent evacuations from secret airfields in the heart of axis-controlled Yugoslavia, the Halyard mission brought its total of rescued airmen, evacuated and returned to combat duty, to 432. Choosing to remain behind and continue his struggle to liberate Yugoslavia, Gener-

al Mihailovich was eventually caught, imprisoned and executed by Tito for alleged collaboration with the Nazis, a charge which we know now has been fabricated by Tito's mole in Cairo.

I say here today I would hope that the Congress would recognize that the objections to this recognition would finally be overturned and I can think of no more fitting way for the 100th Congress to pay tribute to an American hero, George Musulin, as well, who died earlier this month in Virginia, than to carry out his long-time wish, that General Mihailovich be honored and recognized by the United States of America.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add: Let us finally acknowledge the debt we owe General Mihailovich and his men; at least we should let those who know of his courage and owe their lives to it, show that respect and in the process show us that truth must eventually win out. What better day to begin to redress that balance than the general's birthday.

Mr. CRANE. I thank the gentlewoman for her gracious remarks on this momentous occasion. I know there were colleagues who had anticipated being here with us this evening, but the hour has run on later than most of us anticipated. So I will submit their statements for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, and simply conclude by saying that I followed in the footsteps of a colleague who first alerted me to the role of General Mihailovich and ironically he was not a Serb. It was our former distinguished colleague, the Honorable Ed Derwinski, who had fought long and hard against State Department objections, a body in which he now serves as an Under Secretary—and a distinguished one—but he fought for years to get the State Department to release the suppressed information about the fact that General Mihailovich was the recipient of our Legion of Honor, and that it had been done at the recommendation of General Eisenhower, for his outstanding role in World War II. It had in fact been presented by President Harry Truman. For whatever perverse reason, our State Department endeavored to keep that information quiet.

It is a sad commentary on our own State Department, it seems to me, because there was abundant evidence of the role that General Mihailovich played even when he had in fact been betrayed by our allied forces because of the Communist disinformation that had been fed through British intelligence. We stopped our support; he did not stop his ongoing war against the Nazi invaders. But he was being attacked on two fronts simultaneously. Not only was he fighting the Nazis and in the process contributed mightily to the failure of Hitler in World War II because that is what cost Hitler his

Soviet campaign, but simultaneously he was dealing with an element within his own country of Communists who had put him on their hit list as surely as the Nazis had him on theirs. The subsequent post-World War II information revealed the collusion, the active working cooperation between the Communists in Yugoslavia and the Nazis right down to the very end of the war, notwithstanding the fact that the Soviets, after Hitler doublecrossed Stalin, the Soviets had joined the allied cause theoretically and yet there was still a cozy working relationship that existed between those two elements in Yugoslavia.

To his credit and to the honor of the man, General Mihailovich continued. He did his rescue work of the majority of those American airmen who had been downed at the time we turned our back on him. It was George Musulin, who, as my colleague from Maryland indicated, sadly, passed away last month, and I say especially sadly because he was in the vanguard of trying to get recognition on behalf of the downed American airmen, many of whom are still surviving, who fought for years to get a monument erected in this town to honor General Mihailovich for what he did in their behalf. But George never lived long enough to see that monument.

I would share the views expressed by my colleague from Maryland that this 100th Congress, in the centennial of the Congress of the United States when we are celebrating the bicentennial of our Constitution and we are honoring those immortal lines in the Preamble that those men wanted to secure unto themselves and to their posterity the blessings of liberty, that this is a fitting time, a fitting moment to honor General Mihailovich first, to honor the patriots like George Musulin, who went in there on the OSS operations, headed up that very daring rescue operation, to bring American transport aircraft in, with Nazi camps within just a handful of miles on either side, dramatically land those planes in cow pastures after the cows had been chased off, quickly load the American airmen aboard and get them out. And if you talk to many of those airmen, one of the things that comes across so forcefully is their gratitude not only to General Mihailovich who saved their lives, but to the Serbian people in those homes they were sheltered during the time they were hiding from the Nazis.

These were poor mountain folks who did not have a great deal of resources available at their disposal, but what they did have they insisted that the airmen partake of before they would share it with their own families. They moved those airmen around from house to house, kept them alive and, as I say, over 500 were ultimately rescued because of that loyalty and the

devotion of the Serbian people, not just to the United States, but to really high ideals, the highest ideals that this country has acknowledged, as have those Serbian patriots who participated in that operation.

So as I say, Mr. Speaker, we are honoring the birthday of a great man, the 94th anniversary of his birth, a man who may have felt that the whole world turned on him when he was put to death by the dictator, Josif Broz Tito, but a man whose memory lives on in the hearts of all who believe in liberty and justice.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank my colleague from Illinois. I would like to just make one other remark in connection with the collaboration between the Communists in Yugoslavia and the Nazis.

□ 1740

There was a holocaust in Yugoslavia, just as there were holocausts elsewhere, but this was a different kind. It was not in gas chambers, but they lined up at one point, 7,000 young children, boys, youths between the ages of 7 and 14, and they shot them down. Nobody ever really realizes that we had incidents like that going on in Yugoslavia because of that collaboration. This was the type of thing that Mihailovich was trying to get around and trying to fight.

Mr. CRANE. He was, indeed, and the fact of the matter is, as I say, his story, like that of any contribution to the highest ideals of civilization, is one that they could keep buried under a bushel. His light has surfaced and I thank all of my colleagues who have devoted any time and energy to researching and backgrounding in anticipation of honoring this great hero for contributing to putting a flame up that will focus on the achievements of a man who should be memorialized in our history, just as surely as in his own.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my good friend and colleague PHIL CRANE to honor Gen. Draza Mihailovich. PHIL's efforts to ensure that General Mihailovich's place in history is remembered are commendable.

General Mihailovich was Yugoslavia's foremost freedom fighter. He began leading his people in resistance against the German occupation in April 1941. He was singularly responsible for saving the lives of more than 500 American airmen forced down on bombing missions involved over German-occupied Yugoslavia. He eventually was caught, imprisoned, and executed by General Tito for allegedly collaborating with the Nazis.

March is a fitting month for this tribute to the great General Mihailovich. He was born on March 27, 1893. In addition, President Truman conferred the honor of Legion of Merit in the Degree of Chief Commander posthumously to General Mihailovich—one of the highest honors which our Government can give to a non-American.

Our Department of State continues to claim that a controversy still remains regarding the role which the general played. However, the only controversy that has ever existed regarding Mihailovich's efforts is based on fictitious Soviet propaganda.

General Mihailovich deserves better. He was a true savior to more than 500 airmen he rescued. He remained a loyal ally even after his movement in Yugoslavia was abandoned by the West. He represents all that is good in the quest for individual freedom. His ultimate sacrifice for these goals should be remembered and cherished.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the commemoration of Gen. Dragoljub Draza Mihailovich, a genuine nationalist hero of Yugoslavia's fight against Hitler in World War II.

Unfortunately history has become distorted and Tito and his Communist partisans have received most recognition for the defeat of Hitler. But it was the anti-Communist General Mihailovich and his followers who never flagged in their brave struggle against the Nazis. Because he was anti-Communist however and the Soviet Union was our great—if temporary—ally, the allies were misled into supporting Tito. General Mihailovich was never fully recognized for his great patriotic services.

The Teheran conference of December 1943 resulted in the Allies' abandonment of General Mihailovich and ultimately resulted in the death of 500,000 loyal Yugoslavs.

But there are many of us who remember the heroism of General Mihailovich and his soldiers and who are pleased to acknowledge his services to all mankind despite the distortions of history.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a man who dedicated his life to helping his country rid itself of Nazi and Soviet intervention. Col. Draza Mihailovich led a heroic resistance movement in Yugoslavia against the German occupation forces during World War II. His dedication and courage was invaluable to Allied forces fighting for freedom in Europe.

A Soviet disinformation campaign to discredit Mihailovich as a Nazi collaborator led Churchill to abandon Mihailovich, in favor of Soviet-backed Marshal Tito. Mihailovich, no longer supported by Allied forces, continued to be instrumental in helping over 500 United States airmen gain freedom after their planes had been shot down over German-occupied territory. I believe that after 40 years, international recognition for Draza Mihailovich is long overdue. I will support all efforts to erect a memorial to honor this man who worked so hard for Yugoslavian freedom.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, it is important to begin with a note of appreciation to a distinguished colleague from Illinois, PHIL CRANE. Congressman CRANE's statement today was a vivid reminder of all that General Mihailovich's forces did to assist American servicemen in the Second World War.

That war was begun when Soviet Communists and German Nazis tore apart the Polish Republic, and with it the health and peace of the world. The war ended, as the title of Churchill's history reminds us, with tragedy as

well as triumph: Some one-half of the European peoples we fought to save from occupation and tyranny became prisoners again, prisoners behind the Iron Curtain of a newly expanded Soviet Empire.

It was not Mihailovich but another General, Tito, who took power and ruled in the postwar period. Tito made Yugoslavia a cooperative and sometimes enthusiastic member of the Communist international until his expulsion from the Comintern by Joseph Stalin in 1948.

Where does Yugoslavia stand today vis-à-vis the United States? For all the aid we poured into the country in the postwar years, for all the diplomatic support we gave Titoist communism, and despite Belgrade's continued possession of most favored nation trading status, the country's government is deeply anti-American. I am glad that the wartime conditions under which General Mihailovich helped us are unlikely to be recreated; I will say however that it would be almost unbelievable if anyone in the current government were ever to show the helpfulness toward us which Mihailovich showed.

Look for a moment at Yugoslavia's current foreign policies. One tally of U.N. General Assembly votes in the year 1985 shows Yugoslavia voting in concurrence with America less than 12 percent of the time. That is worse than Poland's record, or Romania's or even the Soviet Union's. A 1984 General Assembly tally is worse than 1985: Yugoslavia was with us 8.8 percent of the time, markedly below the whole Soviet Communist block.

So instead of repeating endlessly, as Washington policymakers and university professors are wont to do, that Yugoslavia is nonaligned, we should ask ourselves what that means to the United States. It means that Belgrade opposes our interests as consistently as do our worst enemies, and yet we say nothing about it for fear somehow that things could get worse.

Who are Yugoslavia's friends, if not the Americans? The PLO, for one. The flight of *Achille Lauro* mastermind Abul Abbas to Belgrade, where the terrorist group enjoys the privileges of a formal diplomatic embassy, was but one incident among a dozen others which could be cited.

And Libya. Belgrade made a military agreement with Libya in October 1981. It sells the Libyans ships and armaments. The two governments' armed forces conduct high-level meetings. And Yugoslavia trains Libyan aviators and services Libyan submarines.

Then there is Cuba, which like the PLO and Libya claims to be nonaligned but in fact is predictably pro-Soviet. Last April the Cubans and Yugoslavia struck a 5-year agreement to double bilateral trade to \$300 million. In September Fidel Castro spent 3 days in Yugoslavia and the upshot was an official press release about "the further development" of mutual relations.

What is true of Cuba is usually true of Nicaragua, and so it is no surprise that Managua, too, has excellent relations with Belgrade. More than \$140 million in Yugoslavia aid—and I'm sure that estimate is far too low—has been delivered to Managua since 1979, despite the Eastern European country's \$20 billion debt to the West.

Even relations with the Soviets are more regular than most Western analysts will admit. For example, Belgrade holds formal observer status in Comecon, the Soviet bloc's international economic union, and participates in 23 of its 33 specialized commissions. Yugoslavia attended the Comecon meetings in Havana and Cienfuegos last April, for example.

Far more disturbing is the pattern of military cooperation with the U.S.S.R., which becomes especially visible in times of crisis, such as the 1973 Middle East war. The Soviet armed services and those of the bloc states enjoy far better relations with Yugoslavia than is usually admitted publicly, as Dr. Harold Rood demonstrated irrefutably in his 1980 volume on geopolitics titled "kingdoms of the Blind."

In such circumstances it is difficult to remain unconcerned by the news of September that the head of the KGB, Viktor Chebrikov, made an official visit to Yugoslavia to complete an agreement on security cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, the neglect of General Mihailovich, who did so much to help our airmen, is only matched by our steady indulgence of Tito and of Tito's Communist successors. Such a policy belies the hard realities of what Belgrade is doing in the world. And it is certainly of no help to the Yugoslavs, who neither want nor deserves the tyranny of communism.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to point out to you and my colleagues the remarkable heroism of Yugoslavian Gen. Draza Mihailovich during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the general was truly a hero with a special tie to our country, for not only was he a leader of his country's resistance to the Nazi occupation, but he was also a special savior to over 500 U.S. airmen fighting in Europe.

It seems that he spearheaded an operation designed to rescue American airmen who had been shot down in Yugoslavia behind the Nazi line. This operation sheltered and cared for at least 500 U.S. flyers until they were rescued, and was in the end responsible for saving their lives. In 1948, President Harry Truman awarded the Legion of Merit to the general in recognition of his heroism and in gratitude for his help to the hundreds of U.S. airmen saved through his rescue operation.

It is unfortunate that the high-level Communist mole named James Klugman got away for so long with trying to damage General Mihailovich by altering British intelligence coming out of Yugoslavia. It seems that Klugman also drafted bogus reports to make Mihailovich look like a Nazi collaborator.

Mr. Speaker, the National Committee of American Airmen rescued by General Mihailovich want to establish a memorial to him, at their own expense. They need Congress' permission to do so, however, because they want to erect it on public land.

I do hope that nothing will stand in the way of this simple request so that the men saved by General Mihailovich might honor him and his heroism.

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, World War II was a time when the globe was tied up in a superhuman effort to defend the rights of individuals from aggressors who designed to infringe upon their personal freedoms. There are many stories of pain, defeat, betrayal, and

atrocities. Needless to say, there are also stories of personal heroism and triumph which in history will far outweigh the horrors of that war.

I would like to speak today in memory of one of those heroes who, if he had lived would be 94 years old this week. Gen. Draza Mihailovich was one of those who rose up to defend the integrity of his nation and the personal freedoms of his countrymen. His efforts as leader of the Chetnik resistance forces successfully challenged the expansion of the Nazi regime into Yugoslavia in 1941.

For these efforts, General Mihailovich is a true Yugoslavian patriot. However, his sacrifice went further than this. During his struggle he was able to rescue and protect 500 downed American airmen fighting in Europe. For this he can be considered a truly selfless humanitarian.

History records that he was the most successful contributor to the rescue plan Operation Halyard during August 1944. What makes the feat even more laudable is that he had been cut off from American support some time before. Faulty British intelligence advised that the United States abandon support of General Mihailovich in favor of the less impressive forces of Marshal Tito. Without American support and with no political reason to lend assistance, General Mihailovich continued to back our effort and care for our servicemen.

It is these same airmen who have for 40 years supported a tribute to their savior, General Mihailovich. In 1948 President Truman honored the general with the Legion of Merit in recognition of his unselfish heroism and in gratitude for his help.

Today, we simply want to remember a man on the 94th anniversary of his birth. A man who, despite not being an American, made sacrifices to defend the ideals which this country stands for, and who showed character we should all aspire to.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a recognition of the 94th anniversary of the death of Gen. Draza Mihailovich, the great Yugoslavian patriot. The general was executed many years ago in 1946, but his importance lives on. Any man who is willing to stand as a symbol of resistance in the lonely struggle against totalitarianism should be honored by a nation such as the United States. We are the embodiment of the belief in freedom and democracy, and the spirit of the struggle to halt the spread of totalitarianism.

During the bloody course of World War II, General Mihailovich displayed the intensity of patriotic heroism and dedication to freedom that burned in his character. Not only did he fight to resist the invasion of the expansionary Nazi Germany, but he fought to challenge the machinations of the Communist minority in Yugoslavia. He fought external aggressors and internal opportunists to sustain democracy and freedom in his homeland.

And Mr. Speaker, during this battle he was able to give comfort to, and in fact, save the lives of over 500 downed American airmen. These men have fought hard to remember and honor the general—their savior—for nearly 40 years.

Because of a bizarre irony, most of this fight to remember has been uphill. Deliberately reworked British intelligence reports stipulated that the general was a Nazi collaborator. Later proven to be the disinformation of a Communist mole in British intelligence—James Klugman—the damage had already been done. History shows that the general was indeed an anti-Communist, but certainly not a Nazi collaborator. His aim was to resist any infringement on the national integrity of Yugoslavia or any debasement of the personal freedoms of Yugoslavian citizens.

In time, Winston Churchill urged on the basis of those faulty intelligence reports, that the Allies withdraw support for the general. He fought on as spirited as ever, and continued to facilitate the escape of hundreds of American airmen who had been downed during bombing raids over German held territory. His efforts continued after the liberation of Western Europe and were redirected toward the Communist forces of Marshal Tito.

For all his unselfish heroism he was both executed and honored. In 1946 after a Communist show trial accused him of Nazi collaboration, Marshal Tito ordered him executed for treason. In 1948 President Truman honored him with the Legion of Merit in the Degree of Chief Commander for "contributing materially to the Allied cause and being instrumental to final victory." The cold war had begun. It is the nagging irony of this story that his Presidential honor was kept classified and secret until many years later so as to not anger the new Communist government in Belgrade. Yugoslavia is still Communist and many of Eastern Europe's resistance fighters are now in the United States.

Today the world should know of the heroism of Gen. Draza Mihailovich. The purity of his effort pitted him on the side of democracy and against aggressive totalitarianism; with freedom-loving Yugoslavians and the United States, and forever against Nazi Germany and communism.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague from Illinois in honoring the memory of Gen. Draza Mihailovich. His is a memory that we must keep alive, but unfortunately has faded over the years for most Americans.

For 500 American airmen downed on bombing missions during the Second World War, General Mihailovich's memory will never fade—and will certainly never die. It was General Mihailovich and his Chetnik resistance force that rescued these airmen and insured their safe return to duty. According to many sources, this was the largest American rescue effort in history.

It is most fitting and proper that we should honor General Mihailovich at this time, for almost 40 years ago President Truman awarded the Legion of Merit in the Degree of Chief Commander to General Mihailovich. In awarding one of the highest possible honors to a foreign national, President Truman noted: "Through the undaunted efforts of his troops, many U.S. Airmen were rescued and returned safely to friendly control."

These Airmen are still working today to preserve the memory of General Mihailovich in a tangible way. Despite the intransigence of several Congresses and administrations, this

group, known as the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich, has tirelessly lobbied for a permanent monument to the general here in Washington. I am pleased to note that the president of the national committee, retired Maj. Richard Felman is a constituent of mine from Tucson.

But we honor General Mihailovich today not for the special place he holds in the heart and mind of Major Felman or any of the other 500 Airmen who the general saved, but rather for the significant place he rightly deserves in history as a leader in the fight against totalitarianism—both of the right and of the left.

In 1979, then Governor Reagan, in noting General Mihailovich's considerable legacy, praised him as: "a symbol of resistance to all those across the world who have had to fight a similar heroic and lonely struggle against totalitarianism."

While much has been done to obscure his contributions and efforts to secure the freedom of both Americans and his of fellow countrymen from Nazi totalitarianism, it is my hope that by our efforts here today we will contribute in some small way to a greater understanding and appreciation of his role in history—not only as a rescuer of downed American airmen but as a freedom fighter opposing tyranny.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have come here today to commemorate a man who would make a fine American, Gen. Draza Mihailovich.

During World War II, his tenure as the leader of the Yugoslavian resistance afforded him the opportunity to display a great depth of patriotic heroism and unselfish sacrifice. Perhaps never as much as when, through his own personal dedication, he rescued and cared for over 500 American airmen downed while on bombing runs behind Nazi lines in Romania.

An association of these men, the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich, survivors of terrible circumstances in a terrible war, has fought to honor the general for nearly 40 years. He was their savior; they are alive today because of him.

But because of a bizarre irony which has taken years to resolve, these men and their efforts have been thwarted. During the war, a high-level Communist mole in the British intelligence services, later identified as James Klugman, was able to malign General Mihailovich and do him damage which eventually cost his life.

By drafting bogus intelligence reports, Mr. Klugman crafted a profile of General Mihailovich as Nazi collaborator and anti-Communist. History shows that the general was an anti-Communist, but certainly not a Nazi collaborator. His aim was simply to resist any foreign aggression and restore freedom in Yugoslavia. Based on faulty intelligence, Winston Churchill made the determination that General Mihailovich be cut off from British support. The United States, trusting the well-respected British intelligence network, soon followed suit. This Allied assistance was redirected in support of Marshal Tito, a Communist whose agenda General Mihailovich did not agree with.

However, at the time, the Allied armies were involved in an anti-Nazi alliance with the Soviets and their operatives throughout Eastern Europe. It was not until after the war that we realized how untrustworthy the Soviet regime really was.

And this is the sad irony of Gen. Draza Mihailovich. While he was accused of Nazi collaboration and executed by his rival Marshal Tito in 1946, his forces did far more than Marshal Tito's to forward the Allied cause in Yugoslavia. Prior to his trial an American commission heard testimony from the flyers he saved and who were denied the right to testify in his behalf in Belgrade. The commission cleared him, but Belgrade ignored the findings.

Two years later in 1948, President Truman posthumously awarded the Legion of Merit in the Degree of Chief Commander to General Mihailovich for "contributing materially to the Allied cause and being instrumental to final victory," but kept it secret for years so as to not offend the new government in Belgrade. Furthermore, despite being an avowed anti-Communist he is credited by historians for slowing the Nazi march on Russia, forcing the German offensive to bog down in the winter of 1941-42.

Today, Yugoslavia has been Communist for 40 years and Marshal Tito is dead. The Soviet Union, our allies in World War II, have shown their true colors and refused to leave a truly beautiful half of Europe. Germany is rid of her Nazis, split in two, and the Western half prospers as part of the free West. And finally, Harry Truman is gone, Gen. Draza Mihailovich is long dead, and his Legion of Merit stands as our sole commemoration of his sacrifice.

Today let us remember the spirit of sacrifice he exemplified on what would have been his 94th birthday.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich have been, for nearly 40 years, desperately attempting to properly honor the man who was responsible for their survival during the Second World War. The persistence of these men who have carried on their quest for proper recognition of their savior is commendable and, when taking into account the horrifying conditions they were rescued from, understandable.

On March 29, 1948, President Harry S. Truman conferred the decoration, Legion of Merit in the Degree of Chief Commander, to General Mihailovich. The award was given in recognition of his role in the rescue of some 500 American airmen during the latter days of the Second World War. This award is among the highest honors that can be bestowed upon a foreign individual by the Government of the United States, and it, along with the accompanying citation, is ample proof of the gratitude then felt by this Nation toward General Mihailovich.

Even with the strong recommendation of President Truman, the Congress has not granted the wish of these surviving airmen to have the U.S. Government build a monument in honor of General Mihailovich. Beginning in 1974, and for each successive Congress since that time, this group of American veterans has petitioned Congress for permission to

repay their debt to the general by erecting a memorial in his honor. This permission has twice been granted in legislation that passed the U.S. Senate, in 1976 and 1977. To date, the House of Representatives has failed to seriously consider identical legislation.

The least we can do now is honor General Mihailovich on his birthday. General Mihailovich was born on March 27, 1893. Although 94 years have now passed since his birth, we should nevertheless acknowledge this day and pay tribute to this great man.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man of great courage and conviction, Gen. Draza Mihailovich. This week will mark the 94th anniversary of his birth, but his spirit lives on in all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

General Mihailovich, the great Serbian hero, fought the Germans from April 1941 until the end of the war when the Soviet troops entered Yugoslavia from Bulgaria and installed the Communist dictator Tito. During those years the general distinguished himself by rescuing nearly 500 American airmen shot down behind enemy lines and sending them back to safety.

One of the remarkable facts about Mihailovich is that he was provided with very little help from the allies, and yet still was able to operate an effective resistance organization. Unlike Tito, who was able to transmit propaganda from the U.S.S.R. and was given large quantities of material aid by the Russians, the general was given next to nothing. Yet, Mihailovich and his Chetniks—guerrillas—were responsible for decimating the 22 German divisions located in the Serb-Greece area. From April 1941 to December 1944 the Germans lost 80,000 killed and 125,000 wounded.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, with the words President Harry S. Truman spoke as he awarded the Legion of Merit to General Mihailovich:

General Dragoljub Mihailovich distinguished himself in an outstanding manner as Commander-in-Chief of the Yugoslav Army Forces and later as Minister of War by organizing and leading important resistance forces against the enemy which occupied Yugoslavia, from December 1941 to December 1944. Through undaunted efforts of his troops many United States airmen were rescued safely to friendly control. General Mihailovich and his forces, although lacking adequate supplies and fighting under extreme hardships, contributed materially to the Allied cause, and were instrumental in obtaining final Allied Victory.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 94th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Draza Mihailovich, I want to take this opportunity to commend to you and to my colleagues the remarkable heroism of this man during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, General Mihailovich was truly a hero, with a very special tie to our country. Not only was he a leader of his country's resistance to the Nazi occupation, but also, to 500 U.S. airmen fighting in Europe, he was a savior.

General Mihailovich spearheaded an operation designed to rescue American airmen who had been shot down in Yugoslavia behind the Nazi lines. This operation sheltered and cared for at least 500 of our countrymen

until they were rescued. There is no question that he, in fact, was directly responsible for their lives being saved. Some of the individuals who were saved have family ties in my district.

In 1948, President Harry S. Truman posthumously awarded the Legion of Merit to General Mihailovich in recognition of his heroism, his sacrifice, and his unwavering dedication to freedom; and in gratitude for his help to the hundreds of U.S. airmen saved through his rescue operation. As the President said at that time, General Mihailovich contributed "materially to the Allied cause" and was "instrumental to [the] final victory."

In addition to this official recognition of his contribution to our country and to the cause of freedom, the men who were rescued by the general formed an organization—the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich—to pay tribute to the man who saved their lives and to keep his memory alive.

Unfortunately, as we now know, during the war a high-level Communist mole, by the name of James Klugman, falsified intelligence reports coming out of Yugoslavia, and depicted the general as a Nazi collaborator. The truth came out, but the damage had been done, for this brave and unselfish individual has yet to receive the full recognition due him.

His actions and ideals represent what our country has stood for, and in tribute on the occasion of his 94th birthday, I salute this genuine freedom fighter.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored to participate in today's special order commemorating the heroics of Gen. Dragoljub Mihailovich.

During World War II, General Mihailovich and his guerrilla army of Chetniks were renowned for fiercely resisting the brutal Nazi occupation of their homeland. At a time of terrible darkness, this brave man offered hope to his beleaguered people.

In the United States, General Mihailovich is best remembered for the role he played in saving the lives of over 500 American airmen downed in Yugoslavia during the war. Over 40 years later, these grateful men still work to honor the memory of the general who was responsible for rescuing them from torture and death.

Risking your life to save someone is truly a courageous act. To go beyond this and to risk your life repeatedly under conditions of war constitutes heroics worthy of recognition and remembrance. Surely there was no greater test of valor than to risk death by saving American airmen when one could have so profitably betrayed them or turned away in fear.

Let me share with you the words of President Harry S. Truman in describing this hero. He stated that, "General Dragoljub Mihailovich and his forces contributed materially to the Allied cause and were instrumental in obtaining a final Allied victory." President Truman later bestowed a great honor, the Legion of Merit Chief Commander citation upon the general.

Tragically, General Mihailovich was unable to enjoy the blessings of peace for which he had so ardently struggled. As we all deeply regret, he was unjustly executed at the end of

the war by Marshal Tito's rival forces. It is a cruel irony that the general survived years of fighting the Nazis only to fall victim to a Communist show trial, a proceeding which could only be described as a travesty of justice. Had this misfortune been averted, I am convinced that General Mihailovich would have served his nation as nobly in peacetime as he had in wartime.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity, in closing, to note that the United States still owes a great debt of gratitude to Gen. Dragoljub Mihailovich for the hundreds of American lives he helped to save. We must persevere to ensure that his proper place in history is forever remembered.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, for over 40 years, a group of American veterans have been attempting to clear the name of a Yugoslav general who saved their lives in World War II. Originally hailed as a hero by the Allies for his resistance campaign against the Nazis, Gen. Draza Mihailovich was suddenly abandoned by Winston Churchill, despite reservations on the part of the United States. The support of the Western Allies was withdrawn from the general's cause and reappropriated to General Tito, the leader of the Communist forces in Yugoslavia at the time. Evidence now reveals that this decision was based on falsified intelligence reports that charged Mihailovich with collaboration.

The recent release of previously classified documents from the top secret World War II Office of Strategic Services [OSS], coupled with startling revelations from abroad, cast new light on one of the Soviet Union's earliest and most successful disinformation campaigns. Information contained in these documents now makes it clear that General Mihailovich was the victim of an active campaign of subversion conducted by James Klugman, a highly placed Communist agent in British intelligence and close associate of master spy Kim Philby. Working for British intelligence out of Cairo during the war, Klugman skewed intelligence reports from Yugoslavia and submitted these to Allied command.

Even after he had been abandoned by the Western Allies, General Mihailovich and his forces were responsible for saving the lives of over 500 American airmen who were shot down or forced down over Yugoslavia on their way back from raids on Axis oil installations and bridges in Romania. Picked up, clothed, fed, medically cared for, and protected by Mihailovich's Chetnik forces throughout Yugoslavia, these airmen became eyewitnesses to the bitter battles between Nazi and Chetnik forces, and reported absolutely no incidents of collaboration.

These American MIA's were later evacuated from secret airfields in the heart of Axis-controlled Yugoslavia and returned to combat duty. General Mihailovich refused an offer from the Allies to provide him with a sanctuary and decided to remain in Yugoslavia and continue his struggle to liberate Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, General Mihailovich was finally caught, imprisoned, and executed on trumped-up charges of having collaborated with the Nazis.

On March 29, 1948, Harry S. Truman, on the recommendation of Gen. Dwight D. Eisen-

hower, posthumously awarded the Legion of Merit in the Degree of Chief Commander to General Mihailovich in recognition of his services to the Allied cause. In his speech, President Truman remarked that "through the undaunted efforts of General Mihailovich's troops, many United States airmen were rescued and returned safely to friendly control."

Given the large number of articles and books which have recently been written on the history of the Second World War, as it was fought in Yugoslavia, it is difficult to understand why anyone should continue to question the loyalty and integrity of General Mihailovich. But our own State Department still refuses to exonerate General Mihailovich of charges of collaboration with the Nazis. The Department of State recently claimed that a controversy still remains regarding the role which General Mihailovich played. The only controversy that has ever existed concerning the general's activities derives from fictitious Soviet propaganda.

The State Department, on the same occasion, went on to assert, "Mihailovich's forces expended a substantial share of their efforts in actions against Tito's Partisans; that is, Communists, rather than joining the latter in the resistance." General Mihailovich was an ardent nationalist and, consequently, did not want to be subjected to the totalitarian oppression of communism any more than that of nazism.

I have always believed that the United States has supported and will continue to support freedom fighters engaged in the struggle against totalitarianism. As Americans, we praise the heroism and tenacity of the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan and the anti-Communist resistance in Cambodia, yet our own State Department, which we can in part hold responsible for the failure of the freedom movement in Yugoslavia, will not even go so far as to recognize that there was a legitimate nationalist movement in Yugoslavia in the 1940's. This situation brings to mind the closing remarks from a letter written by Gov. Ronald Reagan in 1979, in which he stated, "It has been demonstrated beyond doubt that both freedom and honor suffer when firm commitments become sacrificed to false hopes of appeasing aggressors by abandoning friends."

General Mihailovich was not only a friend and savior to those 500 American airmen that he rescued, but he remained a staunch patriot and ally even after his resistance movement was abandoned by the United Kingdom and the United States. It is one thing to be fooled by a disinformation campaign conducted by highly placed spies within an intelligence network and quite another to allow this misinformation to persist some 40 years later in the face of the truth. Nothing can be done to reverse this great injustice that sealed the fate of General Mihailovich and his freedom movement in Yugoslavia. But at the very least, we can honor General Mihailovich by remembering that 94 years ago, on March 27, 1893, General Mihailovich was born. We owe it to him, the patriotic Chetniks who fought with him, and the remaining American flyers whose lives he saved.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the time this evening to address some comments with regard to where we stand as far as the development of a budget in the House Committee on the Budget, where that stands.

I think it is fair to go back to the beginning of this year, or maybe even the end of last year, when, for the first time, as a result of the passage of Gramm-Rudman, it was necessary for the President early this year, within the first week in January, January 5, I believe, to submit a budget. The President did, in fact, meet that deadline and presented a budget which, according to the Office of Management and Budget, was a budget that, in fact, met the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction requirement; that is, to receive or to get to a point where the deficit was no greater than \$108 billion in fiscal year 1988.

Immediately after the President's proposal was received, we began to hear a great deal of talk from Democrats as to what was wrong with the President's plan, whether they disagreed with his proposals as far as revenues were concerned, or whether the President's proposal actually would meet the target. So, for the next 2½ months, we have heard a lot of talk from the Democratic Party. We have heard a lot of talk from the Members of the House Committee on the Budget, that is, the Democrats on the House Committee on the Budget, as to what was wrong with the President's plan.

I guess that is saying it politely. They spent a great deal of time running around the country bashing the President's budget. Each time I heard them in this conversation, I was convinced that the next day, we were going to see their plan. I guess, to put the whole discussion in more of a perspective, for the last several years, there has been a lot of rhetoric on the part of the Democrats as to the lack of leadership on the issue of the budget.

So one would assume that when 1987 rolled around, that is, when we started to develop the process for the 1988 fiscal year budget, that since the elections in November changed the makeup of the other body, and now we see that Democrats control both legislative Houses, one would have assumed that we would have seen their plan.

But it appears that there is an inability on the part of the House Democrats to put a plan together. There is a failure in the discipline. There is an inability to take the mandate, which they claim that they got in November 1986, and to move forward with that plan.

As a result of all this inaction and all of this talk, we were asked—we, those of us who are members of the Committee on the Budget on the Republican side—for the first time—this is my fifth year on the committee—we were asked for the first time to become involved in the development of a bipartisan plan.

I thought that that was rather unique, that just at the moment when there was an inability on the part of the Democrats to even come up within their own party as to what their plan was, after months of bashing the President for his plan, then to ask us to become involved as if we were going to have some real impact is rather interesting to me when it seemed like all they wanted to do was to put their plan forward, to have us put our fingerprints on it, and then we could say it was a bipartisan plan. Then the country would never have had the opportunity to see the plan that the Democrats had come up with.

I think that the point that they are trying to say that we are not involved in the budget discussions, I think, is totally erroneous.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlemen taking this time so that we can discuss this.

I think it is important for all Americans to understand what is going on, and the statements that he has made in regard to the previous years' service on the Committee on the Budget are certainly true.

Here we arrive at a point where normally the Democratic Caucus, I understand, prepares, in conjunction with the Democrats on the House Committee on the Budget, their position to come forward with. They got into the position where they could not compromise with themselves, so that lay out last year's spending levels—which is fine, if that is the way you are going to do it, but they are really not serious about voting for the proposal they put forward. So what they want to do now is invite us in so that they do have the bipartisan budget, as you have said.

I think it is important for everyone to understand what our leader has done and what the Speaker of the Democratic Party has said back and forth.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the gentlemen feels any differently than I do, that you are prepared to become involved in a meaningful discussion with our colleagues on the Committee on the Budget if we can just see from what position they want to move.

This is what, late March? The President's plan was up here in early January and, to this date, we have still not

seen—maybe there really is not one, but we have not even seen what the plan is as far as the Democratic budget is concerned.

I have heard rumors to the effect that their plan is to reduce the deficit by \$36 billion. That \$36 billion, assuming that that is what they are going to do, does not come anywhere near reaching the Gramm/Rudman target of \$108 billion that we started with.

If that is what their plan is, I am not sure you and I want to get involved in a discussion over that.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the button that I am wearing today is indicative of the \$108 billion that Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-Mack required that we achieve in fiscal year 1988. It is important that we stick to that.

This is not the time to let the quicksand get under our feet. It is the time to stand firm and really settle on this \$108 billion target. As the gentleman points out, there is no way that we should get involved in a process where—I believe there are 22 Democratic members on the House Committee on the Budget; is that correct?

Mr. MACK. That is about right.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I think there are 14 Republicans, so any time they want to put any kind of a budget through, they do not need the Republican members on the House Committee on the Budget to put that through. All they have to do is just vote up or down. They have been unwilling to do that, in fact, and they have brought forth a budget that was last year's level.

I have a comparison here that shows that they would arrive at a deficit of \$109.35 billion. That is the plan that was laid before us last Friday, I believe it was.

Mr. MACK. Was that the Democratic plan?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That was the Democratic markup plan, I believe.

Mr. MACK. Was that their proposal?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That was their proposal. That is their budget, but they were unwilling to vote up or down on that, I believe.

Mr. MACK. I am a little bit confused now because if you are saying that there actually was a budget that the Democrats brought forward that called for a freeze in spending all across the board, were they really implying that they were going to freeze defense at last year's levels, that they were going to freeze Social Security at last year's level, and not allow for the new retirees to come into the program? I do not understand that.

□ 1750

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think that is exactly the point they

started at, because if you are in business, as the gentleman was at one time and as I was in business, we would not mind starting from last year and going forward. However, I think that the way the Democratic majority has laid this on us, they were not intending really to do anything but just get the Republicans involved so that they then could have a bipartisan effort. I think there was absolutely no question that it was a tongue-in-cheek budget. I think that is the best word I could use to describe it.

Mr. MACK. So what the gentleman is saying is that there was a proposal on the table which was a working document that said in effect, "this is not our plan. We disavow this. This is just what the spending levels were from last year, and we would like for you to get involved with us to help create our budget so we can in essence say that you were involved in a budget that raised taxes, cut defense, and had some marginal impact on social spending"; is that true?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was not at the hearing when you did go forward with some of this markup, but I understand there were a number of Members who wanted to continue to try to draw the Republican Members in, and we had a stipulation in a letter which went to the Speaker from our leader which requested that certain things be done by the Democratic leadership so we would know that we just were not being brought along so they would have a bipartisan stamp on it. But this letter which our leader wrote to the Speaker, JIM WRIGHT, was in fact to try to draw out the problems in the budget process and try to see if we could help to reform this system as we work on the 1988 budget.

Mr. MACK. Well, before we get on to the letter, let me say this—I should say, "letters" really, because there have been several that have gone back and forth between BOB MICHEL and Speaker WRIGHT and also Chairman GRAY. If we could, let us get back to the \$108 billion, because when the gentleman mentioned the button there, for a minute it kind of reminded me of our Republican conference this morning when the President came. He, too, was wearing a button, and he challenged us in what I would call the first really meaningful step in the budget fight for 1987. Let me explain that.

He said that it is his objective to get to \$108 billion to comply with the Gramm-Rudman targets, and then he said to the members of the Republican conference that it was his intention to veto the highway bill that was passed, and he challenged us to sustain that veto. In essence, he was making the point that "if you can't sustain this veto, then you are not going to be able

to hold together and meet the target of \$108 billion."

So I would say the President's challenge, asking each of us to sustain his veto this morning, is the first major step in the budget battle in 1987.

Let me then make one further point about that. If we do win, if the President is able to have his veto upheld, then I think the clear message to the Members, both Republicans and Democrats, is that this is going to be a year in which there is going to be a fight over any major spending, and that the President is going to veto anything that he considers to have too much expenditure called for in it, and he is going to be looking to us to sustain his vetoes.

So I would say that this is step No. 1, and fight No. 1 is the question over the transportation bill.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield further, it is almost step No. 2, though, because the President did put forward the budget, as the gentleman pointed out, on the 5th of January which met the target of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-Mack of \$108 billion. So this is step 2, challenging us to meet the target again. So certainly you and I have no problem doing that.

I think the serious problem we have here, though, is one of public attention to the budget process, with the fact that we are sort of having to play here before the TV cameras to try to focus the light of day on this problem. The committee chairman has run around the countryside talking about the fact that they were going to meet the targets. They said they were going to do it, but we have never seen a plan that really does that.

Mr. MACK. But, if I may reclaim my time, even from the comments we are hearing, at least from what is being reported in the papers, there is no plan that I have heard of or seen in print that has talked about a deficit reduction plan that comes anywhere near the \$108 billion target.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That is certainly true. There is this continuing discussion about how it is kind of unrealistic and "we can't do it, and it is bigger than anything we can do here." The fact of the matter is that the President has done it. While many of us, even from his own party, may be not totally enamored of his budget plan, he has done it and proven it can be achieved. You and I know that. We have worked on the numbers.

I think clearly it is time for the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives and the Democratic Party which controls the U.S. Senate to lay out how they are going to have these new ideas move forward to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill which they also voted for.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman brought up the question about these letters. It might be helpful to give some kind of background about what these letters represent.

If the gentleman will help me in this, I recall that there was an attempt a couple of weeks ago to say that we ought to have a bipartisan effort on putting together a plan, and our reaction was this: We look at Lucy in the "Peanuts" cartoon in which the football is put down year after year after year, which on this occasion would represent bipartisan action, and just as the ball is about to be kicked, the ball is removed.

So many of our colleagues expressed real concern about the fact that we were being taken in one more time. But even after all the expressions of those concerns, it was determined that we ought to try once more to see if we could get some kind of bipartisan movement as far as the budget is concerned. So a letter was written, if I am not mistaken, by Vice Chairman LATTA to Chairman GRAY saying that there were certain conditions that we would want to have them respond to before we would agree to go into a bipartisan effort on the development of a plan.

Well, the discussion apparently took place, and they said, "Well, maybe we can move forward," but before the letter could be delivered, Chairman GRAY decided that he was going to move forward in the markup session with the document that the gentleman referred to earlier.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I believe in fact we got a notice that the committee would meet, and there was a press conference before that, was there not?

Mr. MACK. That is exactly correct. So before we even had our meeting with our leadership to determine what that letter should include, we were informed that "we have changed our minds. We don't want you to be involved." So that meeting fell through.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. So basically, rather than going to the committee and really dealing with the problem, they were out in the media trying to win a budget with the \$108 billion number in the media.

Mr. MACK. Yes. Again let me stop here and stress what is going on. All of this show—and that is what it is—all of this show was to put up a smoke-screen so they do not have to come forward with their plan. Everything they are doing is trying to force us to participate in the very early stages of writing their document.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was not here earlier. I happened to turn on C-SPAN and saw the dialog that was going on here, and I recognized that you are trying to

bring out some of the issues that we on the Budget Committee have been trying to bring out to the press.

Unfortunately, we have been trying to deal with this issue as though we were Members of Congress trying to force the budget process to do what it is supposed to do, and that is present a budget. I think the gentleman from Oregon has eloquently pointed out that we have at every turn been faced with what is basically high theater, or low theater, as the case may be, and we have been finding out what the Budget Committee was going to do through the words of TONY COELHO, who, if I am not mistaken, is not a member of the Budget Committee—I have not seen him there, and I do not think he is an ex officio member—and of the Speaker. Frequently what has happened is that the statements that have been made in camera, in the budget hearings or in the meetings that we have had in the various offices, and the statements that the chairman of the committee has made have never been predicated upon approval of the Speaker or of Mr. COELHO. Yet, we find out what is going on by reading the press clippings, by turning on the television, and by listening to the statements about the President's budget, and yet we have not seen what they have as an alternative. Is that correct?

Mr. MACK. That is correct.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the gentleman as a member of the Budget Committee and as a freshman that in the first few months I have been there, I am really frustrated about the process because I do not really think there is an intent on the Democratic side, at least on the leadership side, although I think some of the members of the committee might wish to have one, to bring forth an alternative to what the President is required to bring under law.

Mr. MACK. You know why, do you not?

Mr. BUECHNER. I certainly would like to hear the gentleman's opinion on it. I have my opinions.

Mr. MACK. To be really straightforward, they do not want it to be seen. It is awfully easy to talk about what their document should be when they did not think they were going to have to produce one. But November 1986 changed all that. They now control both Houses of the legislature. They cannot hide behind the statement: "Well, let's wait and see what the other body does."

□ 1800

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield on that point, for the past 6 years when the Senate has been in the hands of the Republican Party, the President's party, if you will, we have been in a position on the House side where we had to sort of wait and

see what Senator DOMENICI was going to do and we had to try and work together with the other body and we were sort of in a position where we needed to work with them.

At this point, we are in a position where the Democratic Party is now trying to say that we have to wait until the Senate comes out. That is not right any more; we do not have to do that. In fact, why would we come out and show our cards before they show their cards? If you are a card-player, that just does not happen. We are not the "dummy" hand.

Mr. MACK. Well, some people might think we are.

Let me put into perspective this whole discussion about who should put the plan on the table. Again, this is my fifth year in the Congress, fifth year on the Budget Committee, so I have somewhat of a limited number of years to draw on, but my experience has been that this is not the normal procedure. It is fair to ask the question about what the normal procedure is.

Let me just read to you a little note that I made here. "Under Chairman GRAY, the procedure has been to present a Democratic majority proposal to the full committee for its consideration. That is, the first document that the members of the House Budget Committee have seen on the Republican side in the years that Chairman GRAY has been chairman, it has been their budget proposal." This is now the unusual year. He customarily gives us little advance time to analyze it, because the majority usually is not really interested in a bipartisan product.

This year, when the majority is having difficulty developing a budget which can meet the Gramm-Rudman deficit targets of \$108 billion in fiscal year 1988, the chairman has suddenly shown a real interest in trying to entrap the Republican minority one way or another into his problems. Our position has been that we are delighted to become involved in the process just as soon as you have put your budget on the table.

Now, if we should happen to read during the next few days that there is a budget plan from the Democrats then I think we can declare victory here. Because the whole purpose, what we have been trying to do is to say if you want to negotiate, it is only fair that there be two documents, and we just want to see yours.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly right. We have to have the plan out there to begin with. If they were really serious about the document that we had presented last week as the markup document, I think we could have probably taken an up-down vote on that right there and maybe that would have

been sufficient and we could have been done for the year and just taken it to the floor from there.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. I am sorry once again; I apologize for being late, but were you able to reiterate what that document really was that was the 1987 budget that they said was, what a working paper, they referred to it. They did not actually take credit for that being a budget and we all know and I think the public knows that. I cannot believe that the Democrats were going to offer a budget which would have so drastically cut Social Security that would have literally meant that we would be like Brazil, that we would refuse to pay our debts to our own citizens in foreign countries.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield, I think that is exactly right. If they were willing to vote on that proposal. There are some of us around here who think that ultimately in order to get this problem put together we are going to have to allow for new people into Social Security but not pay a cost-of-living adjustment.

But I do not think that the Democrat majority who are on the Budget Committee or in this House are ready to vote on that plan. I think it is a very serious problem when we are saying one thing in public and trying to do another thing in private. I certainly think that the budget they laid out there—the one thing about the budget there though is that it does come awfully close to meeting the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target of \$108 billion.

Mr. BUECHNER. That is true, and I think that is why the gentleman said that in preparation for this ill-timed meeting that the Democrats are trying to lure us into something that if that was meaningful, that if they wanted to really come to that figure, that that would have been something that we could talk about but they are not willing to pin themselves down to that. They really, it was sort of like, "You tell us what you are willing to do and then we will tell you whether we are really serious."

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield, in fact did not the chairman say that his members were not ready to vote for this proposal; they would not vote for it or support it, but in fact this was going to be our document.

Mr. BUECHNER. That is correct. And, if I remember reading in the Washington Post, apparently that the Democrats had met on their own without any input from the Republican Members, which is their right, and had been literally unable to come up

with a document from which to commence. Therefore, they reverted back to that, knowing full well that it was not, I think using legal terms, equitable terms, they did not have clean hands when they walked into that room with us.

Not having clean hands, I find it ludicrous that they can then continue to bash on the President's budget as being ill-conceived, irresponsible. When TONY COELHO talks about the little white lies in the President's budget, he is using that as a subterfuge to cover up the failure of leadership on the Democratic side of the budget process.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to ask all three of the gentlemen who happen to be members of the Budget Committee a question that I think the American people have asked over the last several years. That question arises from the position of the Democrat leadership in numbers campaigns to the effect that it is Ronald Reagan who has been spending this country into a major deficit. They have said over and over again that national leadership campaign, leadership of this House and the leadership of the other body on the Democrat side have said that President Reagan is a guy who has been spending more money than this country has been taking in and that he is the one who is responsible for "the biggest deficit in history."

Now, I would just want to ask each of you your own opinion as to what perception the American people should draw from this current situation in which the President has submitted a budget, ostensibly meeting the Gramm-Rudman targets and the Democrat leadership now has a chance to come in and be fiscally responsible and they have opted not to act. What message should the American people take from this present situation that you three gentlemen are so heavily involved in and the Democrat leadership is involved in?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield, I think what people should look to is the action of the Congress of the United States. We in the House in the minority have seen bill after bill that comes through over what the President has recommended and many of us have voted "no" on those appropriation bills.

Not a dollar is spent that is not approved by the Congress of the United States. And the President sits in a constitutional role but the Congress is the one who spends the money.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me ask one other question. The President mentioned this this morning in talking to us he said, "You know, it is pretty tough when you get what is known as a con-

tinuing resolution where you do not pass individual appropriations bills but you ball them all up into one giant bill at the end of the year," and the President does not have any line item veto. He either has to stop the country, basically send Federal workers home without their pay and do a lot of damaging, dangerous things or live with that particular giant ball of funding that is given to him at the 11th hour at the end of the year.

Is that one reason why we have major deficits in this country? That type of procedure?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly right. I think that last year's appropriation process where we put everything together into one, gigantic bill is certainly not the way to run this country and not the way the responsible Congress should work.

With the hands of the Democrat Party firmly on the wheel in both the Senate now and in the House of Representatives, the President has very little choice but to veto the entire bill as in the highway bill that he talked to us about this morning in order to try and get the spending level down to something that he can afford to spend. I think that he made a point this morning, "If you will help me in this veto, and bring me back a bill that will fit our spending targets, we will be happy to put it back in a week and I will sign it."

Mr. MACK. Let me add a comment to the question of the gentlemen from California. I was feverishly looking through my papers here to see if I had this document with me but I do not.

What the graph showed were the levels of spending authorized and appropriated by the Congress since this President has been in office. You can compare that level of spending to what the President had requested. You are going to see in the graph that the Congress has spent more money each year than the President has requested.

Mr. BUECHNER. If the gentleman will yield, I am not exactly sure of the amount of the supplemental appropriations but when you add those to the current, what was appropriated from last session and what we are doing as we go along, emergency aid for the homeless, we are, even outside of the normal budget process, we are on an ongoing basis each time exceeding that amount putting a new factor into the formula.

□ 1810

So what we are talking about in the process, the process itself is not even static. The Congress has on its own initiative opted above the process each time.

I do not think the American public understands that what they hear

about as the budget, what we are doing is not the budget. Through reconciliation the Democrats have constantly had add-ons. They cannot make enough political promises that stand outside the budget. They have to merge it all together so the American public is unable to perceive exactly what the gentleman is trying to raise here.

What is the message to the American public? The message that we are trying to give is that Gramm-Rudman is attainable, but we need to have such things as sequestration. The President has talked about it. We have mentioned it in our letters. We have raised it in the Budget Committee. Even the chairman has said—has the chairman not said, gentlemen, that he believes that we have to have the Executive back at the wheel, that the Executive has to take some part, maybe put OMB in the sequestration project or component?

The reason, and I hope the people out there understand it, is that unless we do it, unless we have somebody who is willing to take the cuts and that can withstand the political pressure, this Congress, especially under the leadership it currently has and has had, does not have the guts to balance the budget.

Mr. MACK. Well, the gentleman mentioned the words "reconciliation and sequestration," which reminded me again, a few months ago we began the discussion about the letters that have been going back and forth. What we basically said, those of us on the Budget Committee, that we are prepared to get into a dialog about a budget, provided it has certain conditions; so we sent that letter to Chairman GRAY. He made some attempt, but in an attempt, you know, trying to tie him down a little bit, he refused to answer, but he made some attempt to respond to that letter.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, but only verbally, we got no letter back. There was a discussion and he said, "Well, I thought I had answered the questions."

Mr. BUECHNER. But he was using jurisdictional questions and legal discussion, and really all we wanted out of the chairman was a sense, if you will, a sense of the committee that it was important to deal with.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it was very important to get him on paper so that we had something that we could back up the discussion.

Mr. MACK. Let me just kind of bring this up to the next step, because again our reaction was, well, since we could not get a definitive answer, that maybe there was some difficulty that the chairman was having, that he had to deal with the Speaker, and so maybe we should in fact direct a letter

to the Speaker, so in a followup letter with a couple additional points that were added to it, it was sent to the Speaker.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if maybe we ought to go down through these seven points that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] put in that letter.

Mr. MACK. If the gentleman would do so, I would be pleased.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. We have already talked about the first one.

No. 1, we must have a budget proposal submitted by the committee majority as a basis for discussion.

No. 2, a final document should contain full and complete reconciliation instructions with full enforcement of these instructions spelled out in the resolution. This would be good teeth.

Mr. MACK. Yes, I was just going to say, why do we not just stop for a moment here and get a couple comments from all of you as to the importance of reconciliation. The gentleman might want to expand on that.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Well, this is my seventh year here in the Congress. In 1981 the one time that a budget resolution made any difference would enforce spending changes, cuts, if you will, was in the Gramm-Latta budget reconciliation package in May 1981. Since then we have never really had a reconciliation that did not add to it.

This is the teeth. It enforces and makes the authorizing committees change the legislation so that things do not automatically happen that increase spending.

Mr. MACK. So if I understand the gentleman correctly, what the reconciliation bill does is that it attempts to carry out what the budget called for.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. MACK. Therefore, in other words, if there were legislative actions that had to be carried out, this reconciliation bill took care of those actions.

In other words, as the gentleman says, the budget is passed and it is really nonbinding.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. It is the road map that facilitates all these changes in spending.

Mr. MACK. Following up the budget is the reconciliation bill which carries out what the budget said we were going to do.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That is exactly right.

Mr. MACK. The gentleman said he had been here 7 years and there was only 1 year in which we really had a meaningful reconciliation bill.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Only 1 year that we had a reconciliation bill that really changed the spending levels downward.

Mr. MACK. So when we get through with the budget process, the next thing that comes along is reconcilia-

tion and it is that piece of legislation that carries out the budget. That really is the meaningful piece of legislation, and not the budget resolution itself.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That is exactly right. The gentleman is exactly right. There is no force of law in the budget. It is a document of the Congress.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think a good example would be that last year the Democrats tried to reauthorize the Housing Act in the reconciliation bill. They tried to take the hospital insurance trust off budget, in violation of that 1983 bipartisan agreement on Social Security, and they also tried to sell Government loans with full recourse. I think we all know that would have meant a loss in loan receipts as well as still having full liability for any loan defaults; so they use the process whenever they can abuse it, and that is basically it.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is the third point in the letter from our leader, the gentleman from Illinois, BOB MICHEL, to the Speaker, JIM WRIGHT. That sentence is: "That reconciliation package should be brought to the floor with no new additions to it or incomplete action on the prescribed nondiscretionary reductions."

Mr. MACK. So in other words, what we are asking for in the letter is a commitment on the part of the leadership to bring a reconciliation bill to the floor of the House that would do no more than what is called for in the budget resolution.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. With no additional spending.

Mr. MACK. No additional spending. No new programs. I just wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is fair to point out that by narrowing this reconciliation project, we do not keep Congress from doing what it is supposed to do.

Mr. MACK. In no way.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Let me, if I can, continue with point No. 4 in the Michel letter to the Speaker, JIM WRIGHT:

That the Appropriations Subcommittees must be made to comply with their 302(b) outlay levels, with any failure to comply subject to a point of order. Further, that the so-called "Fazio exception" which allows the Appropriation Committee to bring forward bills which meet their discretionary number even though the Budget Committee outlay ceilings have been breached, must be eliminated.

Now, what has occurred in the past, as the gentleman well knows, is that the Budget Act, the 302(b) spending levels and the points of order that we would make against them here on the floor, which is a procedure by which we could object to bringing forth this

kind of document, are waived. We are trying to just put some more teeth into this act.

Mr. MACK. If the gentleman will go on then, let us finish this up.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. All right. Sentence No. 5 in the Michel letter to the Speaker:

That any omnibus appropriations bill will be discouraged at all times and that no such bill be brought to the floor of the House without approval of the bipartisan leadership for fiscal years 1988 and 1989.

Mr. MACK. Let me if I could just break in there. Is this omnibus appropriations bill, we are used to hearing the term around here, "continuing resolution," is that basically what this is referring to?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That certainly would be how it has been couched around here. It was the same thing that happened last year where we put all 13 appropriation bills into one big ball of wax and brought them through the body.

Mr. MACK. So in other words, what we were saying was that if we are going to make a concerted effort, we are going to work together to put together a budget resolution that would meet the \$180 billion target, we want your commitment that what we are going to do is we are going to work through each one of those appropriations bills, get them to the floor, have them debated, have a conference with the other body, bring those conference reports back and get those appropriation bills through the House, not have a continuing resolution where you can have over half a trillion dollars' worth of spending in one bill and then send it down to the President and say, "OK, now you go ahead and veto it." Is that the situation?

□ 1820

Sentence No. 6, that no provision in the budget resolution provide for any adjustment in individual or corporate income tax rates.

If the gentleman remembers, the Speaker, JIM WRIGHT of Texas, has made the point a number of times that maybe we ought to stop some of the changes in the 1986 tax law in order to raise more taxes from the American working people so that those taxes could be utilized in spending and our budget process.

Here again, what we said was we put this budget resolution together and the only commitment we are asking you to make as far as taxes are concerned is just we do not want you to renege on the tax rates we agreed upon in the tax reform package. I mean, that is fair.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MACK. If it was just me, I would have gone further than that. But again, all we were saying to the Speaker is we just want your commit-

ment that you are not going to raise the income tax rates, and he would not even respond to that. In a moment we will read the letter and he did in fact respond.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. The last sentence in the Michel to the Speaker letter, sentence No. 7 is that Gramm-Rudman be corrected to make the automatic sequestration procedure meet any constitutional challenge. Of course, that refers to the fact that the Supreme Court took the trigger mechanism, the teeth, out of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-Mack proposal where there was not going to be an automatic taking down of the budget levels if we could not agree in the Congress to any meaningful solution. So basically what started out as a very good approach to try and get the budget balanced by 1990, had the teeth pulled by the Supreme Court almost immediately, so we were just asking to try and correct the system.

Mr. MACK. Let me read a portion of the letter we received from the Speaker:

As to your specific suggestions to Chairman Gray, I understand he responded to your initial 5 points in the committee last week.

Now, there is no question he did respond, but as I indicated, he would not be definite when asked specific questions.

Then the next sentence is: "The two new suggestions * * * and mind you, this is the letter to the Speaker of the House. We first of all wrote the letter to the chairman, and the chairman said some of the things we were asking were beyond his jurisdiction. 'The two new suggestions—Nos. 5 and 6—are clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee.' Well, why does he think we wrote the letter to him? I mean, the Speaker of the House certainly is in a position to say to the Budget Committee, now look, this whole process has to move forward, and in order to move it forward these are the things we ought to agree upon. If we do not agree, let us at least negotiate those. Why should we get into the negotiation of a budget when we cannot even get them to sit down and negotiate these points?"

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If the gentleman will yield further, basically he never did answer those five points on paper. We are still in the smoke and mirrors area like we talked about earlier, and the little white lies Mr. COELHO refers to basically as one of the reasons we are trying to get something on paper. And all this letter is designed to do is to get an answer from Chairman GRAY.

As the gentleman points out, if this is beyond his capabilities, points 5 and 6, certainly the Speaker—who is he going to go to next? I do not think he is going to the other body.

Mr. MACK. The gentleman is quite right.

Let me make two points.

The question might be raised why did you include the additional points in your letter to the Speaker as opposed to Chairman GRAY. It is the Speaker who first came out with the statement that he thought it would be appropriate to raise the tax rates; or another way to say that is to not allow the lower rates we approved in the tax reform package to go into effect. In other words, the Speaker said I want to raise taxes through raising rates, so we said if we are going to be sending the letter to him, certainly we ought to include that, and certainly we ought to ask the question of the Speaker about the Gramm-Rudman targets. So it seemed very appropriate that the letter we sent to the Speaker include those two very significant points.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking out this special order. I would like to make a few comments.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one further thing?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I noticed Chairman GRAY had a response, or I understand a press release or statement in response to the letter of the Speaker. Does the gentleman have that? Maybe I could read it to the gentleman.

Mr. MACK. Why don't you go ahead.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. It is a statement of WILLIAM H. GRAY III, chairman, House Budget Committee, response to Republican refusal to meet this afternoon, and this is dated March 24. I will read the text.

Here we go again. We had expected a legislative process, not a diplomatic negotiation. Instead, we have another delay and another excuse for the President to lambaste the Democrats. I would remind my Republican colleagues that the Gramm-Rudman deadlines apply to the entire Congress, not just its Democratic Members.

I am surprised. We were just trying to get some of the Gramm-Rudman language back in so we could be sure it would work and meet the 108 target.

Mr. MACK. As the President said this morning, he is committed to the 108. He wants to see whether the Democrats are committed to the 108.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I would like to make a few comments relative to the Budget Committee. It is a privilege for me to serve on the

Budget Committee, although I am as frustrated probably as most of my Republican colleagues.

I was deeply disappointed at the Speaker's reaction in his letter that he sent, because as Republicans we thought what we had asked for was eminently fair, and we had hoped that we would receive a statement in principle from the Democrats that would allow us, and I think the country, for the first time in a long time to have what would truly be a bipartisan budget resolution. I think it is time to put politics aside, and I think it is time for the Democrats to do what is reasonable.

The list we had of basic understandings that the gentleman described earlier was not even given the dignity of a real response, either by the chairman or by the Speaker. I submit that if the Democrats were truly interested in the development of a bipartisan budget, at least they would have engaged us in a conversation about the merits of what we thought were very reasonable ground rules.

I think the Speaker's letter is an admission that the majority party wants to use the Republicans and not involve us. I am further amazed that the ground rules we proposed were dismissed as if they were designed to be partisan and unacceptable. It is interesting to me that most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I have talked to, they think what we have asked for is very reasonable. We asked for no income tax increases.

Frankly, as I walk on the other side of the aisle, I see a great number of my friends, particularly from the South, on that side of the aisle who share with us the concern that we are going to try to tax our way out of this problem.

We asked to put the sequestration trigger back in Gramm-Rudman. The Democrats voted for that Gramm-Rudman bill, and they voted for the enforcement mechanism 2 years ago, so what is wrong with now putting that back in place?

As has been described, we asked for assurances of effective reconciliation and efforts to avoid another omnibus appropriations bill. No one, I do not think, on this side of the aisle or that side, wants to repeat the breakdown of the budget process we experienced last year.

And we asked something that I think is very fair, for a copy of the Democratic draft.

Mr. MACK. Excuse me, we asked for a copy of the draft?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Of what their proposal is for a budget, a starting point, if you would. Historically, the majority in the committee, it is my understanding, has made that available.

Mr. MACK. It certainly has been Chairman GRAY's procedure in the past to bring the Democratic Members

of the committee's proposal as a beginning point. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I think the American people and many on the other side of the aisle would agree that is only fair, it is only reasonable that we have a starting point. They had the fun of beating up on the President's proposal for several months, and I did not agree with everything in the President's proposal. But, nevertheless, the President's proposal did meet the 108. It did not have a general revenue increase, and maybe it is not what we need, but on a bipartisan basis, if they will start off with a document that seems to be reasonable, we can go from there.

□ 1830

But what has happened, to quote a friend of mine in Tennessee, what they are doing is they want to run with the rabbits and chase with the hounds. Now, you cannot do both. You cannot criticize on one hand the President for meeting the 108 and the mechanism that he used to meet the 108, and then over here say "Well, we're not going to come forth with a document. We want to do it together."

Well, that has never happened before. These new-found friends of ours on a budget tell me that they cannot do it or they will not do it.

I say that they made a big thing out of governing. I do not think—it is not a fact that they cannot govern; I think it is a fact that they will not govern; and this is a sign of weakness, in my estimation, that they are not governing in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make the point that during those discussions we had in committee as to whether we were going to participate in the markup of some kind of working document that they would not own, the chairman in essence said, "Well, if you want—let me tell you what's going to happen to you if you don't participate. That is, that we'll just go back into caucus—we're going to put a plan together—we can come out here and just—you know, you're going to have to take it."

That was really no surprise to me. That happened to me a year ago; that happened to me 2 years ago; that happened to me 3 years ago; that happened to me 4 years ago.

So I am not particularly shocked that they might take that process, or take that method of putting their budget on the table, but I will say this: If in fact that Chairman GRAY does that, at least we will have a plan that is a democratic proposal as to what the spending and taxing of this Nation should be.

Up until now, we still do not have one.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I can

recall the vote last week on defense; I believe it was 13 to 3. The eight votes that we had on our side would not have made any difference.

So if they want to proceed with the budget document, they can go ahead and proceed without our help. They are trying to politicize the process, and I would be willing to make a guess, and I will ask the gentleman if he would agree with this, that if we took the request that we made to the chairman and to the Speaker, and ask our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—apart from political pressure, 1 to 1 and said; Do you think these make sense? Do you think these are fair? Do you think these are reasonable?

I would venture a guess that two-thirds of the people we talked to would say "What you've proposed is fair and is reasonable."

Mr. MACK. Let me respond to that, Mr. Speaker. That is an interesting point. I think certainly there are some members of the Democratic Party that want to try to find a way to reach the 108. Certainly there are some Members over there that would like to avoid the raising of the tax rates, but I am not too sure that we are going to get that kind of response from their leadership. At least, so far as we have heard that they are not too enlightened, too excited about reaching that target and holding the rates.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I think that is exactly right. What we are seeing is, we are seeing a game of political chicken that has been initiated against us and that is not reasonable, and it is not fair.

What we are asking for is what is fair and what is reasonable for the American people. That is, we want to sit down together as equal partners and talk about the priorities of this country and fashion this budget document where we all have to make some sacrifices, and we all have to have the input of a variety of regions of this country, of different political parties; and I cannot think of anything that is more important to this Congress; I cannot think of anything that is more important to the well-being of the economic conditions in this country than for Republicans and Democrats to sit down together and work out a budget.

We are willing to be participants, but I do not think that the Republican Members of the Budget Committee are not—we are not willing to be pawns in this process. That is what, it seems to me, it seems to be a game with the Speaker and with the chairman, to try to position us in a way that is politically advantageous.

We are not looking for political advantages. We are looking for results that will solve the budgetary deficit problems in this country without taxing the American people, a group that is already overtaxed. We are not

undertaxed in this country; we are overspent.

I think we have to sit down and do what is reasonable. I thank the gentleman for taking this special order, because I think it is important for us to communicate to our colleagues that we are willing, and we are ready to sit down on a bipartisan basis.

What we have asked for is very simple, and it is very fair, and it is reasonable, and I do not think in a body like this the opposing party can ask for any more.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming out and participating in this special order. He is right, Mr. Speaker, we do need to see that our message gets out as to what is going on here, and clearly the message is that at least up until now the Democrats have failed to show any discipline, they have failed to show the ability to put together a consensus on their side along the plan that apparently the Speaker is interested in.

What we keep reading about is an increase in tax collections, of \$18 billion a year, and I think it is rather interesting that the Speaker wants to add an additional \$18 billion in tax collections when just over the last 4 years, if you go back and look at how tax collections have increased each year, 1983 to 1984, 1984 to 1985, 1985 to 1986—those increases fall in the range of roughly an average, anyway, of between \$50 and \$60 billion a year in new tax collections, and that does not satisfy the Speaker; he wants to add an additional \$18 billion, or I would say somewhere in the neighborhood of 25 to 30 percent in new tax collections, because he just is not satisfied with the present level.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one more question, I would like the gentleman's opinion on this.

If we put this to a vote in our districts at town meetings, I believe that most of my constituents; I do not know about Florida, but I suspect it would be similar to Tennessee; would say that if we raise taxes that we will not cut spending.

Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. MACK. I would say that the overwhelming reaction is that if there is a new tax dollar that has found its way in to Washington, it will be spent.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Is not that historical? Did we not do that a few years ago when we said we are going to raise taxes and cut spending?

Mr. MACK. Absolutely.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Was the spending reduced?

Mr. MACK. I think anyone who looks at those numbers knows that spending was increased.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK. Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. I thank my friend from Florida. I apologize for not having been here earlier.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been here, I have heard the terms "reconciliation," "sequestration," "Gramm-Rudman targets," and I understand what you all are talking about, and I bet you anything it has been fully explained to the people who are listening to the remarks.

For my personal part, I would just like to boil it down into terms that I can understand and I know that my constituents will understand, and I think what we are talking about here is really two competing visions for our country, and I just want to take a second on that.

Most of the folks over there on the Democrat side of the aisle, as represented by their leadership, honestly believe in expanding Government domestic programs, would you not say?

They honestly believe in that; they believe that America will be better off with more and more Government intervention.

That philosophy—I will never forget it—was represented by a statement that the last Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill made. This is, I believe, a direct quote. He told the Members of this body that "America is great because its government is great. Because its government does great things for its people." Not that America is great because its people are great, but America is great because its government is great.

Harry Hopkins, who used to work for F.D.R. as an adviser, used to express the same philosophy, in "tax and spend, tax and spend." That is where that phrase came from.

Even our current Speaker, JIM WRIGHT, has a tax plan of the week every week.

So there is a big debate going on here. Most Republicans, I believe, want to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government, reform welfare, return work fare into our welfare; require people who receive welfare if they are able-bodied to work or to hunt for a job, maybe go to work on our public roads and our parks, on our infrastructure. That seems to be the philosophy of the Republican Party.

Both parties say they want to reduce the deficit. In reading the newspapers and serving with my friend on the Budget Committee, we know that TONY COELHO, JIM WRIGHT say they want to reduce the deficit by cutting defense, again, and raising taxes. Is that right?

□ 1840

Mr. MACK. That is right.

Mr. BOULTER. Whereas we had, on the Republican side of the aisle, tended to say very, very strongly no new taxes at all. But I just feel, I say to the gentleman from Florida, like I have been invited to a banquet when they invite us to go into a bipartisan session with them on the Budget Committee. It is tempting because we all want to work with our Democratic friends on the Budget Committee. I do not think it is a matter of distrusting our friends on the Budget Committee from the Democratic Party, in fact I do trust most of them, especially BILL GRAY.

It is a problem with their leadership, when TONY COELHO, Democratic whip, bashes our President on the head with a press conference just as we are trying to try to get together with them, that is not fair. I do feel like I have been invited to a banquet and through me to my constituents, and all I ask for is let me see the menu. I like you guys, I want to sit down with you and work on this great American problem, but I want to see the menu. I want my constituents to know that really the first dish has already been served, it already has been, if you look at the budget platter. The appetizer, so to speak, I believe was the congressional pay raise; that was the appetizer. The soup of the day at this banquet is going to be an \$18 billion tax increase.

The Speaker of this place wants to raise his salary and my constituents' taxes. That is not right. The soup of the day is the tax increase. The entree is a budget fiasco where the Democratic leadership is even talking about freezing Social Security cost-of-living adjustments. I say to the Democrats I want to see what is on the table before I come to this banquet, and they say everything, including Social Security cost-of-living adjustments. I do not think that is fair to the 37 million people who rely upon those benefits. But they also say taxes. That is where we really draw the line, I think. We are not going to be drawn into this trick of working with them and then seeing them produce a budget that they know they have the votes to pass but they know that the American people do not like and will reject because it raises taxes by \$18 billion.

Then finally for dessert the Democratic leadership says we are going to renege on the promise that this body made to our constituents with the Balanced Budget Act, the Gramm-Rudman Act when we are going to eliminate deficit spending over a 5-year period of time and stick to a deficit target in this coming fiscal year which does not exceed \$108 billion a year; they are going to break that promise.

So I think all we are saying is that those are not the proper guidelines for

us to work with you guys under. If that is your menu, we are not going to sit down at your banquet.

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for his participation, and I would just say in closing that we are prepared, we are prepared at any moment, Mr. Speaker—we are prepared to be involved, we are prepared to try to make the process work, we are prepared to try to put a budget together that meets the \$108 billion target. We are prepared to do that without raising taxes.

But Mr. Speaker, to imply that our requests that were put in a letter to you are outside the scope of your authority is just really hard for me to believe.

With that statement, it seems like what you are saying to us is that you are not serious at all about wanting us to be involved in a bipartisan effort to meet the goals.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL AID AND TRADE MISSIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to encourage greater use of existing U.S. agricultural aid and trade programs in an effort to rebuild our export markets. This bill would lay the foundation for expanded market potential in developing nations by providing for greater coordination between our Nation's aid and trade programs.

Last year, U.S. agricultural exports plummeted from a peak of \$43.8 billion in 1981 to \$26.3 billion. And for the first time in almost 30 years, U.S. imported more food than it exported during consecutive summer months in 1986. This sharp drop in agricultural exports over the past 5 years has had a devastating impact on our agricultural economy and rural communities. And despite Federal expenditures of more than \$25 billion on farm programs in fiscal year 1986, thousands of family farms have been foreclosed.

The potential growth markets for our agricultural products are developing nations. Prior to 1981, these countries were an excellent export market. For example, between 1972 and 1983, developing nations increased their grain imports by 107 percent—which is significantly higher than the 46-percent increase in total world grain trade for the same period. This growth in export markets for U.S. agricul-

tural goods was the direct result of coordinated food assistance, economic development, and market-building programs in the late fifties and throughout the sixties. Today, however, food aid and export programs are not being used to their fullest potential.

Private voluntary organizations [PVO's] and cooperatives play an important role in food aid programs. They not only provide humanitarian relief, but also help develop local facilities and businesses that improve the standard of living in these developing nations. And this can lead to market expansion, which when incomes grow, diets improve, and the demand for and ability to purchase food increases.

Providing U.S. food aid to developing countries not only helps these struggling nations, but also benefits our economy where more than 22 percent of the Nation's population is employed in agriculture-related jobs.

The key to moving a developing country from a subsistence stage to the stage of being a significant food importer is to stimulate economic growth. Food aid and export assistance programs can and should be used to stimulate growth and expand markets. They should also be used to their fullest extent to establish the infrastructure that is essential for market expansion for American farm products. Properly administered, U.S. food aid and export assistance programs can lead to future market expansion which will benefit U.S. agriculture in the near and long term.

Our bill would provide for the following:

First, it would establish agricultural aid and trade missions to 15 low- to mid-income countries to develop country by country strategies for economic and market development. These missions, which would be composed of public and private sector representatives, would have 1 year to develop a plan to address the humanitarian, developmental, and marketing needs of each country using the existing U.S. food aid and trade programs.

Second, it would amend the current Public Law 480 and section 416 programs to help private voluntary organizations [PVO's] and cooperatives in carrying out overseas development projects. To do this, the bill would allow PVO's and cooperatives to use local currencies generated from the sale or barter of food aid products to help pay not only for transportation, distribution, or other costs associated with direct feeding programs, but also to help finance agricultural, community, health, credit, and cooperative development projects. Even though current law permits PVO's and cooperatives to use local currencies for development projects, current administrative guidelines have severely limited the types of programs they can initiate.

Third, it would strengthen USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service by adding 50 new employees to help carry out the full range of U.S. trade and food aid programs.

Fourth, and it would put more emphasis on the need to use existing food aid, trade, and export credit programs in financing infrastructure development in importing countries by requiring the Secretary to report annually to Congress on the progress of implementing these goals.

These provisions would make constructive modifications in existing programs. The establishment of trade missions and expansion in

the use of food aid in developing countries would represent a positive step toward rebuilding our market potential abroad and improving our agricultural economy.

REAL PROPERTY ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Real Property Accounting Act of 1987, a bill which would establish equal accounting treatment for commercial banks and thrift institutions. This legislation is vital to the survival of local thrift institutions and the economies they serve.

Under current law, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board [FHLBB] and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation [FSLIC] require the application of so-called regulatory accounting principles [RAP] to troubled assets maintained by thrift institutions. These regulatory principles of accounting are different from the generally accepted accounting principles [GAAP] which govern commercial banks. In general, the RAP system requires write downs of assets on a much harsher basis than the GAAP.

The disparity between these two systems of accounting in many instances results in unfair treatment of thrifts. Because of the RAP system, it is possible for a savings institution to be thrust into insolvency, while a nearby commercial bank with similarly troubled assets remains solvent under the GAAP system used by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC] for Commercial bank regulation.

The bill I am introducing today would establish that the FSLIC and the FHLBB shall employ no accounting method which is any more stringent than the GAAP system in the regulation of troubled assets held by thrifts.

This legislation is needed not only to protect thrift institutions from insolvency, but also to sustain the FSLIC and to relieve local economies of unnecessary financial hardship.

The soundness of the FSLIC is not enhanced or protected by needlessly forcing an insured savings institution into insolvency by requiring it to account for its troubled assets in a manner harsher than that used by commercial banks or, for that matter, private business enterprises.

Instead, as these institutions are forced into insolvency, financial pressures on the FSLIC increase. These pressures have made the FSLIC recapitalization legislation which has been introduced in the 100th Congress extremely urgent. The legislation I am introducing today would help protect the FSLIC as well as well-managed savings institutions.

Other victims of the RAP system include the local economies of which the affected savings institutions are a part. The fire sale liquidation of troubled thrifts' real estate assets at unrealistically low prices disrupts the real estate market and serves to thwart a community's entire economy. These forced liquidations have a negative impact on all real estate values, and as these real estate values are

forced downward, so is the real property tax yield of local and State governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that the majority of the institutions addressed in this legislation are located in local and regional pockets of temporary economic distress. These are institutions located in areas where the local economy relies heavily upon the fortunes of agriculture, the oil industry, and timber. It is true that some of these institutions are troubled because of poor management, and so deserve to be shut down. But the vast majority of these institutions are victims of their local and regional economies. They are trying in good faith to work their way out of conditions they could not have foreseen or controlled. They suffer enough from the economic trauma that pervades their communities. They do not deserve to have their economic stress exacerbated by Federal regulators.

Mr. Speaker, for the economic good of local economies across the Nation, the systems of accounting applied to commercial banks and thrift institutions respectively must be made equitable. I urge your support for the Real Property Accounting Act of 1987 and encourage my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this legislation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UPTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PARRIS, for 60 minutes, on March 31 and April 1.

Mr. MACK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LATTA, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STRATTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOAKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MACK) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UPTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. FISH.

Mrs. SAIKI in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in four instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. LOWERY of California.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mrs. BENTLEY in two instances.

Mr. DORNAN of California in three instances.

Mr. WELDON in three instances.

Mr. PARRIS.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

Mrs. MORELLA in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. McHUGH.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. McMILLEN.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. BOSCO.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. WOLPE.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. JENKINS.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mrs. BYRON.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. RUSSO.

Mr. DERRICK.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. McHUGH.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to designate "National Former POW Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate September 18, 1987, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to designate the month of May 1987 as "National Digestive Diseases Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 26, through May 2, 1987, as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 632. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1979, as reenacted, to extend the duration of the Office of Classified National Security Information within the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On March 24, 1987:

H.R. 2. An act to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 1987, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

976. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the operation of the sugar price support program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

977. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 7-5, "Rental Housing Act of 1985 Temporary Amendment Act of 1987," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233-(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

978. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of the Final Regulations—Leadership in Educational Administration Development Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the Department is proceeding with the transfer of the existing Institute of American Indian Arts to the Board of Trustees of the new Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Art Development (Public Law 99-498), and that it is the Department's position that the new Board would be in a better position to address the need for any new museum facility, pursuant to Public Law 98-306, section 14(b)(2); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

980. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Tourism Marketing, Travel and Tourism Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting a marketing plan to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States in fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2123(a)(15); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report of political contributions by Sol Polansky, of Maryland, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States-designate to the People's Republic of Bulgaria; and John Shad, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States-designate to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

982. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the Department's calendar year 1986 report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 522(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

983. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report that describes the operation of an out-of-region land and property selection pool to meet Federal obligations to the Cook Inlet Region, Inc., pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1611 nt.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

984. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report entitled, "Outer Continental Shelf Lease Sales Fiscal Years 1978 through 1983: Evaluation of Alternative Bidding Systems," which is in response to the requirements to evaluate alternative bidding systems and competition found in section 8 and 15 (43 U.S.C. 1337 (a)(9) and 1343) of the Outer Continental Shelf Land Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

985. A letter from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Executive Secretary), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for October 1986 through November 1986, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Small Business.

986. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled, "Assessment of Impact of Current USDA Foreign Assistance Activities on United States Agricultural Exports," pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1736z(b); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

987. A letter from the Executive Director, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Medicare Prospective Payment and the American Health Care System"; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Ways and Means.

988. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the 10th report entitled: "Comprehensive Program and Plan for Federal Energy Education, Extension and Information Activities," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7373(2); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

989. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a courtesy copy of the Board's annual report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1985, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President in his message of September 25, 1986; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

990. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the determination that the Government of Jamaica has been sufficiently responsive to U.S. concerns on drug control and added expenditure of funds is in the national interest of the United States, pursuant to Public Law 99-190, section 537 (99 Stat. 1308); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1827. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes. (Rept. 100-28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAUB (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

H.R. 1776. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide long-term care benefits under the medicare program and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction of premiums paid for long-term care policies and to permit pension plans to provide similar long-term care benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICA (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) (by request):

H.R. 1777. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RIDGE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York):

H.R. 1778. A bill to improve the safety of imported raw agricultural commodities produced with pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to conform the treatment of residential lot interest expense to current law treatment of second home interest expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1780. A bill to amend the National Housing Act and the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to prevent the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board from requiring institutions within their jurisdiction to write down or establish reserves against assets in amounts in excess of what would be required under generally accepted accounting principles; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1781. A bill to reduce the rate of duty on allyl chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY (for himself, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. QUILEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DAUB, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FIELDS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. JONTZ):

H.R. 1782. A bill to recognize the organization known as the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H.R. 1783. A bill to make technical corrections in certain defense-related laws; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1784. A bill to extend, under certain circumstances, nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of nonmarket economy countries that are currently ineligible for such treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 1785. A bill to amend chapter 44, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain firearms that are not detectable by airport security metal detectors and airport security x-ray systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COATS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. BOULTER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. NELSON of Utah, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PAKARD, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. WELDON):

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to restrict the making of obscene and indecent communications by telephone; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for improved treatment of small rural hospitals and sole community hospitals under titles XVIII and XIX of such act, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BOXER:

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve congressional over-

sight of defense programs treated in a manner designed to conceal the existence or scope of the program (commonly referred to as black programs); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1789. A bill to require each State to ensure that individuals residing in the State are tested annually for the purpose of determining whether such individuals are infected with the etiologic agent for acquired immune deficiency syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri:

H.R. 1790. A bill to clarify the treatment of certain education loans in bankruptcy proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1791. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 1792. A bill to give the Board of Parole for the District of Columbia exclusive power and authority to make parole determinations concerning prisoners convicted of violating any law of the District of Columbia, or any law of the United States applicable exclusively to the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 1793. A bill relating to negotiations to remove the Canadian tariff on expanded metal of base metal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 1794. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that civilian employees of the National Guard may not be required to wear military uniforms while performing civilian service; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 1795. A bill to establish a Federal, State, and local partnership for educational innovation in elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 1796. A bill to eliminate certain restrictions on the use of natural gas and petroleum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUCKABY (for himself, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. HATCHER):

H.R. 1797. A bill to revise the price support level, and implement a marketing loan program, for the 1988 through 1990 crops of soybeans under the Agriculture Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 1798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax earnings on certain investment accounts for savers and investors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that non-recognition of gain on the sale of a principal residence shall apply where one of the spouses who occupied the old residence dies before occupying the new residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. DE LA GARZA):

H.R. 1800. A bill to assist in the revitalization of rural communities through economic diversification and the provision of community facilities to meet basic human needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. TAUKE):

H.R. 1801. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1989 through 1992; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.R. 1802. A bill to promote the integration of women in the development process in developing countries; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LENT (for himself and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 1803. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 1804. A bill to authorize loans under the Small Business Act for economic injury caused by Federal action, to establish criteria for the determination of substantial economic injury under section 7 of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LUNGREN:

H.R. 1805. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that an independent counsel shall be a full-time position; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 1806. A bill to repeal the special treatment provided by the Tax Reform Act of 1986 of an investment in a technology transfer service organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAVROULES (for himself, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. Flake, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1807. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reform the Capital Ownership Development Program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. DYMALLY):

H.R. 1808. A bill to suspend through fiscal year 1989 the military education program for civilian technicians of the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1809. A bill to establish agricultural aid and trade missions to assist foreign countries to participate in United States agricultural aid and trade programs, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the exclusion for amounts received under qualified group legal services plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. APLEGATE, and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 1811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain benefits to veterans and survivors of veterans who participated in atmospheric nuclear tests or the occupation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and who suffer from diseases that may be attrib-

utable to low levels of ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 1812. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the continuous residence requirement under the legalization program for spouses and children of qualified legalized aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1813. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the continuous residence requirement under the legalization program for parents of U.S. citizen children born on or after December 31, 1981, and before November 7, 1986; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKORSKI:

H.R. 1814. A bill to amend section 207(e) of title 18, United States Code, to require that the Executive Office of the President be treated as a single agency or department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLAZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 1815. A bill to establish restrictions on the provision of financial assistance by the Department of Education to educational agencies in States or other political subdivisions that do not impose certain requirements relating to the inspection and equipping with safety belts of schoolbuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 1816. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to repeal the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to reduce passenger automobile fuel economy standards below the level set by such act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1817. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, to better inform the electorate in elections for the office of Senator or Representative in the U.S. Congress; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 1818. A bill to convey Forest Service Land to Flagstaff, AZ; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. FROST, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 1819. A bill to designate the Tucson Aqueduct, Phase A, of the Central Arizona project as the "Stewart Udall-Barry Goldwater Aqueduct"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1820. A bill to designate the Granite Reef Aqueduct of the Central Arizona project as the "Hayden-Rhodes Aqueduct"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1821. A bill to designate the Salt-Gila Aqueduct of the Central Arizona project as the "Fannin-McFarland Aqueduct"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 1822. A bill to suspend until December 31, 1991, the duty on transparent acrylic decorative articles containing a cavity formed in one wall; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. HILER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 1823. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to revise the schedule for payment of flood insurance to encourage the owners of structures located on land subject to imminent collapse or subsidence to dismantle and remove the structures; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. BAKER, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1824. A bill to encourage the continued exploration and development of domestic energy resources located in hostile areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. DURBIN):

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President with respect to the Bahamas under section 802(b) of the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President with respect to the Bahamas under section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution designating May 5, 1987, as "National Teacher Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to designate October 28, 1987, as "National Immigrants Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to designate October, 1987, as "Computer Learning Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIN:

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution commemorating the 40th anniversary of the Marshall plan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to designate the week of August 23 through August 29, 1987, as "National CPR Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BIL-

BRAY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. DURBIN):

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President with respect to Panama under section 802(b) of the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President with respect to Mexico under section 802(b) of the Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President with respect to Panama under section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution disapproving the certification by the President with respect to Mexico under section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COELHO:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress congratulating the people of Berlin on the occasion of the city's 750th anniversary in the year 1987, commending the people of Berlin for their centuries of great tradition and continuing courage in the face of historical adversity, and recognizing the deep and lasting relations they have with the people of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to recognize the International Association of Fire Fighter and the National Fallen Fire Fighters Memorial in Colorado Springs, CO; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. SAIKI:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Federal funding for vocational education should be continued; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. Res. 130. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should place greater emphasis on the improvement of the capabilities of United States conventional forces; seeking also additional cooperation in conventional defense measures with other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. WOLPE):

H. Res. 131. Resolution to state the guiding principles of United States policy toward South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Res. 132. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to provide to the House of Representatives documents prepared for certain report requirements in the 1986 and 1987 Department of Defense Authorization Act relating to the Strategic Defense Initiative Program and the antiballistic missile treaty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

16. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Lieutenant Governor of Alaska, relative to the establishment of a nuclear freeze; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1825. A bill for the relief of Denise Glenn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 1826. A bill for the relief of Natasha Susan Middeldamm, Samantha Abigail Middeldamm, Naomi Katrina Orloff Middeldamm, and Hannah Emily Middeldamm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. MFUME and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 8: Mr. BALENGER.

H.R. 20: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STARK, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 21: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 118: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 182: Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 186: Mr. McEWEN.

H.R. 260: Mr. COURTER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 281: Mr. COYNE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, and Mr. McCLOSKEY.

H.R. 347: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. YATES, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 372: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. McCANDLESS, and Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 382: Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ESPY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 384: Mr. WOLF, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 385: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 386: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 387: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. STARK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 388: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 456: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 457: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 459: Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 510: Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 515: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 543: Mrs. SAIKI, and Mr. APPLEGATE.
H.R. 557: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 567: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FAWELL, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CARR, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BOUTER, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 575: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 578: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 592: Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 594: Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 606: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 618: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 671: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 672: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 673: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 674: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 675: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 676: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 677: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 678: Mr. WALGREN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 679: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 680: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 792: Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NELSON of Utah, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 898: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 915: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 925: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 936: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 954: Mr. OWENS of New York and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 955: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 967: Mr. MINETA, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1018: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1038: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 1048: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1063: Mr. DELAY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1070: Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 1115: Mr. HORTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.R. 1122: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONKER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1181: Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1185: Mr. OLIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RAY, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 1201: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1202: Mr. DAUB and Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 1216: Mr. WISE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. ESPY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CONTE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. LAGOMARSINO and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 1241: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. OLIN, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 1302: Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1330: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1332: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 1333: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 1334: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1335: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 1337: Mr. WILSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.R. 1340: Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. PENNY, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. STAGERS.

H.R. 1368: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. KASICH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. NELSON of Utah, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1413: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 1425: Mr. GRAY of Illinois and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1546: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1568: Mr. McHUGH.

H.R. 1599: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1604: Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. SAIKI, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1622: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1638: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1731: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 1734: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 1770: Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.J. Res. 52: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. YATES.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 116: Mr. STUMP, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. TRAPICANT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. FISH, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. YATES, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.J. Res. 121: Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MacKAY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. ROTH, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. CARR, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. NOWAK,

Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DAUB, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BLAZ, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LENT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ESPY, Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. GREGG, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. GALLO, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SABO, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. McDADE, Mrs.

PATTERSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. NICHOLS.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.J. Res. 155: Mr. FISH, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FLIPPO.

H.J. Res. 171: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. FROST, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HILER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. HILER, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. McGRATH.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. CROCKETT.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. CARR.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. HEFNER.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HOWARD and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MRACEK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H. Res. 68: Mr. AuCOIN and Mr. PRICE of Illinois.

H. Res. 71: Mr. NEAL, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 200: Mr. STANGELAND.